R. A. L. H. GUNAWARDANA
PhD 1965

COPYRIGHT DECLARATION ON FOLLOWING PAGE

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

THE HISTORY OF THE BUDDHIST SAṄGHA IN CEYLON FROM THE REIGN OF SENA I TO THE INVASION OF MĀGHA (~~833 – 1215 A. D.~~)

b y

Ranaweera Appuhamillage Leslie Herbert Gunawardana

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of London

1965

ABSTRACT

The period of about four centuries from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha is significant in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon primarily for the changes it brought in the organization of the saṅgha. In the ninth and the tenth centuries, the three nikāyas of the Sinhalese saṅgha, which grouped monasteries spread over various parts of the Island under the leadership of three monasteries at the capital, reached the highest stage of their organizational development. As an institution owning extensive agricultural resources, the monastery of this period occupied an important position in Sinhalese economic organization. The immunities acquired in the ninth and the tenth centuries increased its income and extended its control over its tenants. The elaborate administrative system, devised for the new responsibilities of the monastery, was a vital factor which strengthened the cohesion of the nikāya.

The loss of property by the monasteries during the period of Cola rule and again in the period between the death of Vijayabāhu I and the accession of Parakkamabāhu I affected the organizationof the nikāya; and its disintegration led to a new grouping of the saṅgha based on eight fraternities. The unification of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I was achieved by bringing these eight fraternities under a common leadership: it did not involve the suppression of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana nikāyas as has been hitherto supposed.

Throughout the period under study, the saṅgha occupied an important position in Sinhalese society as its literati; as intermediaries in cultural contact with foreign lands; and as functionaries in the ceremonial and cultic practices of the laity. The reforms in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I gave an impetus to the activities of the saṅgha, which is particularly evident in the literary works produced during the subsequent period and in the expansion of Sinhalese Theravāda in South East Asia. They also created, for the first time in the history of the Island, a unified organization of the saṅgha.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis presents the results of my research work under the supervision of Dr. J. G. de Casparis of the School of Oriental and African Studies. I am deeply grateful to Dr. de Casparis who, with his intimate knowledge of the history of South and South East Asia, guided me in the preparation of this thesis and, with his constructive criticism and advice, helped greatly to improve its quality. I consider it a privilege to have worked under his direction. It was Dr. L. S. Perera who first awakened my interest in this subject. I am indebted to him for his valuable suggestions on possible lines of inquiry. I was fortunate to have many useful discussions with Dr. Padmanabh S. Jaini; he took great pains to help me in the preparation of the Appendix. I am obliged to Dr. Hla Pe who showed much patience in explaining many passages from Burmese chronicles and inscriptions and in answering my numerous queries. For their valuable help, I wish to thank Mr. K. Indrapala who checked the references in the Tamil sources, read some of the chapters and made several suggestions for improvement; Mr. D. J. Kalupahana and Mr. T. Rajapatirana who assisted me by readily checking the references in the Tibetan and Chinese originals; and Mr. W. Zwalf whose assistance I often sought in consulting the Sanskrit sources. I am grateful to His Excellency G. P. Malalasekara, High Commissioner for Ceylon in

the United Kingdom, Prof. A. L. Basham and the Venerable H. Saddhatissa for their encouragement and guidance. Without all their help and co-operation, this work would not have been accomplished.

ABBREVIATIONS

AIC	Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon by Eduard Müller.
Art. As.	Artibus Asiae.
ASC	Archaeological Surveyof Ceylon.
	ARASC Annual Reports
	MASC Memoirs
ASI	Archaeological Surveyof India
	ARASI Annual Reports
	MASI Memoirs
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient
CALR	Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register
CCMT	Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times by Wilhelm Geiger.
CII	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum
CJSG	Ceylon Journal of Science, Section G, Archaeology, Ethnology etc.
Cv.	Cūlavaṃsa.
DAG	Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya
EI	Epigraphia Indica
EZ	Epigraphia Zeylanica
Hvv.	Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa.
JA	Journal Asiatique
JAG	Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya
JHSS	The Ceylon Journal of Historical and Social Studies

JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
JRASCB	Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
JRASCB(NS)	Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, New Series.
MRE	Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy, Madras.
Mv.	Mahāvaṃsa
Niks.	Nikāyasaṅgrahaya
Pjv.	Pūjāvaliya
Shsvp.	Sahassavatthupakaraṇa
Sihvp.	Sīhalavatthupakaraṇa
SII	South Indian Inscriptions
Smp.	Samantapāsādikā
ŚSŚ	Śrī Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya by Välivitiyə Sorata
TL	Tamil Lexicon
UCR	University of Ceylon Review
UHC	History of Ceylon published by the University of Ceylon
Vap.	Vaṃsatthapakāsinī
Vsm.	Visuddhimagga

CONTENTS

page

page

INTRODUCTION

A detailed and continuous history of Buddhism is of particular importance for the proper understanding of the culture and history of Ceylon. For Buddhism has been closely linked with the social, cultural and even the political history of the vast majority of its people. The short historical accounts of Buddhism which appeared in the Histoire du bouddhisme dans l'Inde by H. Kern published in 1903 and in Charles Eliot's Hinduism and Buddhism published in 1921 are among the most noteworthy pioneer works in this field. G. P. Malalasekara dealt with an important aspect of the activities of the Sinhalese saṅgha in his Pali Literature of Ceylon, published in 1928. In a paper on 'Mahāyānism in Ceylon' published in the same year in the Ceylon Journal of Science, S. Paranavitana examined the evidence from literary sources and the archaeological material available at the time on the prevalence of Mahāyānist and Tāntric ideas and practices in the Island. This study still remains the most valuable contribution on the subject.

The task of writing a systematic history of Buddhism was first undertaken by E. W. Adikaram whose doctoral thesis on the Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon was published in 1946. He based his researches mainly on the commentarial works on the Pali Canon, datable to the fifth century A.D. Ten years later, the work was taken up by another scholar, Walpola Rahula. His History of Buddhism in Ceylon (3rd century B.C. - 10th century A.D.), though handicapped by the

selection of a too extensive period, reveals the use of a greater variety of sources and a more comprehensive treatment of the subject than is evident in the work of his predecessor.

Though no attempt has been made so far to continue the work begun by Adikaram and Rahula, the subject has received the attention of a few scholars. In a paper published in 1955 in a special issue of the Ceylon Historical Journal, V. Pandita outlined the history of Buddhism in the Polonnaruva Period. In his excellent work, Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule, published in the same year, André Bareau made a detailed exposition of the main tenets of the Mahāvihāra and investigated into some aspects of the differences of opinion among the three nikāyas of Sinhalese Buddhism. Five years later, Heinz Bechert brought out a posthumous publication of a study by Wilhelm Geiger on the Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times. This work contains a section on 'Religion and Culture' in which Geiger brings together the relevant material found in the Pali chronicles. The latest contribution on the subject is to be found in the History of Ceylon sponsored by the University of Ceylon. In the sections devoted to Buddhism in this work, S. Paranavitana presents in outline the main developments in the history of Buddhism up to the sixteenth century.

In addition to the works mentioned above, there are some unpublished monographs which have a direct bearing on the history of the saṅgha. Of these, the Institutions of Ancient Ceylon from Inscriptions (3rd century B.C. - 10th century A.D.) by L. S. Perera, a doctoral thesis presented

to the University of Ceylon, is of particular importance. In this useful work Perera examines in considerable detail some of the institutional aspects of Buddhism. In her doctoral thesis on The Age of Parākramabāhu, Sirima Wickremasinghe assesses the contribution of this king to the development of Buddhism and gives an account of the religious buildings erected under his patronage. More recently, W. M. K. Wijetunga has investigated into the social and religious conditions during the period of Coḷa rule in a thesis devoted to the Rise and Decline of Coḷa Power in Ceylon. Though it was beyond the scope of these works to make a detailed examination of the history of the saṅgha they form a reliable basis for further research and outline many problems which are of interest.

The scope of this thesis covers the period from the reign of Sena I, which witnessed an event of considerable significance in the history of Buddhism in the Island, to the invasion of Māgha noted by the chroniclers for his rapacity and for his persecution of Buddhism. Perhaps the most significant event in the religious history of this period was the unification of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I. This brought under a common leadership the clerical community which had remained divided into several independent factions for more than a millennium. In the ninth and the tenth centuries the three nikāyas of the Sinhalese saṅgha were at the highest point of their organizational development. The nikāya division cut across the structure of the saṅgha to create three groups of clerics who accepted the leadership of three monasteries at the capital - the Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri and the Jetavana. This study examines the organizatio

of the saṅgha in the ninth and the tenth centuries with a view to ascertaining the bases of these divisions and investigates into the subsequent developments which made the unification possible. This investigation forms the basis of an assessment of the nature and the significance of the unification.

The gradual but continued growth of monastic wealth was accompanied in the earlier part of the period under study by the relinquishment by the king of his fiscal rights and of his administrative and judicial authority over the property of the saṅgha. The present study examines the extent and the nature of the ownership of property by the saṅgha, the organization evolved to carry out the functions that the possession of property and administrative authority involved and the changes that these new developments brought in the life of the saṅgha and in their relations with the laity; it brings to light the organizational and particularly the economic aspects of Buddhism which have not received adequate attention in the previous works on the religious history of the Island.

The ninth and the tenth centuries witnessed the later stages of an important development in the history of Buddhism in South and South East Asia. This was the expansion of Tāntric teachings propounded and systematized primarily at the centres of Buddhist learning in the Eastern regions of India. Similarly, the twelfth century marked an important stage of another equally, if not more, significant movement in the expansion of Sinhalese Theravāda which brought Ceylon into prominence as a source of inspiration to the Buddhists of South East Asia. In the context of

these developments, the relations that the Sinhalese saṅgha maintained with the Buddhist communities in lands round the Bay of Bengal form a very important aspect of their history.

The study of these problems is based primarily on material derived from the Pali and Sinhalese chronicles and from archaeological sources. The chronicles provide a fairly detailed and continuous account of the history of the saṅgha which is at times supplemented by inscriptions. The commentarial and sub-commentarial works on the Pali Canon and contemporary literary works help to clarify with additional information some of the problems raised by these sources. Almost all these literary sources, being works of monks, concern themselves with the history of the saṅgha. Yet, it is noteworthy that they represent, with only two exceptions, the work of the Mahāvihāra. Hence, one is placed in the unenviable position of dependence on the incidental references and prejudiced remarks in these works, in compiling the history of the other two nikāyas.

Inscriptional evidence only partly compensates for the deficiencies in the literary sources. A large number of inscriptions still await publication. The edition and interpretation of many of the published records require a considerable amount of revision. This has been attempted wherever possible and the aid of contemporary literary sources has been sought in their re-interpretation. In addition to these sources, Tibetan, Burmese and Chinese chronicles, certain manuscripts found in Tibet and Nepal and epigraphic records from India, Burma and Java provide valuable information

on the condition of Buddhism in Ceylon and on the relations that the Sinhalese saṅgha maintained with other Buddhist communities of South and South East Asia. And despite the difficulties involved in the utilization of available sources, it is remarkable that in the whole of South and South East Asia it is only in Ceylon that such detailed information is available on the organizational and economic aspects of the history of the Buddhist saṅgha during the period under consideration.

Chapter 1

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SAṄGHA

The division of the community of monks into three nikāyas led by three large monasteries situated at Anurādhapura - the Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri and the Jetavana - had become, by the ninth century, a characteristic feature of the structure and the organization of the Sinhalese saṅgha. It is usual to find hermitages in different parts of the Island being described in the inscriptional records of the ninth and tenth centuries as institutions affiliated to one of the nikāyas. The term nikāya originally meant 'group' or 'collection' and was used particularly to denote classified groups of literary works in the Buddhist Canon. Later on it acquired the secondary meaning of 'a group of monks who subscribed to a particular interpretation of the Buddhist scriptures'. Its Sinhalese equivalent and derivative nakā has been used in certain inscriptions to denote larger monasteries like the Cetiyagiri at Mihintale[1] but normally it was used, like the term nikāya, to denote the schools of Sinhalese Buddhism. In the period under consideration, the nikāya in the Sinhalese saṅgha came to comprise a collection of hermitages and monasteries which fell under the supervisory control of one monastery.

The Dīpavaṃsa makes no mention of the divisions among the Sinhalese saṅgha. The first references to the three nikāyas occurs in the Mahāvaṃsa which records that the Dharmarucis and the Sāgalikas broke away from the

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.9R l.A20; Vol. II p.61 ll.A23-24; Vol. III p.222 l.B11.

Theravāda.[1] In a more detailed passage which occurs in a later context, it states that a monk who left the Mahāvihāra in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi (89-77 B.C.) formed a separate faction at the Abhayagiri monastery. Later on, another faction broke away from the community at the Abhayagiri monastery and went to live at the Dakkhiṇārāma. It was for the monks of this last mentioned faction that the Jetavana monastery was built by king Mahāsena.[2] The list of Buddhist sects compiled by Vinītadeva, dated to about the eighth century, and the Tibetan list in the Varṣāgryaprcchāsūtra mention the Jetavanīyas, Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins as the three divisions within the Theravāda.[3] While commenting on the sectarian divisions in Buddhism, the Vaṃsatthapakāsanī states that the Dharmarucis and the Sāgalikas should be identified respectively with the residents of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana monasteries.[4] Further confirmation of this identification is found in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya which specifically states that it was the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery who came to be known as the Dharmarucis and that the residents of the Dakkhiṇārāma who later received the Jetavana monastery were known as the Sāgalikas.[5]

The Mahāvihāra was situated in the Mahāmeghavana park to the south of the city of Anurādhapura. According to the Mahāvaṃsa, it was founded by the thera Mahinda, renowned in legend as the monk most closely associated

---

[1] Mv., 5.13.

[2] Mv., 33.95-98; 37.32-33.

[3] See André Bareau, Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule, pp. 24-27.

[4] Vap. pp. 175-176.

[5] Niks. pp. 12-15.

with the introduction of Buddhism to the Island.[1] In the chronicles, the monks of the Mahāvihāra are sometimes referred to by the names Theriya and Theravādin; these names, however, are applicable to those of the other two nikāyas as well.[2] The Mahāvihāra had within its precincts a number of objects and monuments held in great veneration by all Buddhists, the most important of which were the branch of the Bo-tree brought from Buddha Gayā, the Thūpārāma which was held to be the first stūpabuilt at Anurādhapura and the Mahāthūpa built by the warrior king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi. It seems to have been unrivalled till the end of the third century when Mahāsena razed some of its buildings to the ground, forbade the people to give alms to its residents and built within its precincts a monastery for the Sāgalikas, with a stūpa which was larger than the Mahāthūpa. But the Mahāvihāra survived to flourish as the main monastery of a prominent nikāya and one of the foremost centres of Pali Buddhism.

The Mahāvihāra was patronized by almost all the kings of the ninth and tenth centuries. The grants of wealth, land and immunities are cited and discussed elsewhere.[3] Of the shrines and other institutions at the monastery, the stūpa at the Thūpārāma and the Lohapāsāda seem to have received the most attention. The first was held in such high esteem that Udaya II (887-898) and Mahinda IV (956-972) covered it with strips of gold

---

[1] For a discussion on the identification of the three monasteries, see H. Parker, Ancient Ceylon, 1909, pp. 291-311. ARASC 1954 para 47.

[2] See p.365

[3] See pp. 68-70

and silver.[1] Sena II (853-887) restored the Lohapāsāda, endowed it with 'maintenance villages'[2] and arranged for thirty-two monks to live there.[3] Saṅghā, a sister of Kassapa V (914-923), repaired it and crowned it with a pinnacle.[4] Sena II also built a shrine by the Bo-tree and repaired the conduit which conveyed water up to the tree.[5] The Ganthakāra hermitage was restored by Kassapa V.[6] In an inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery, a king, identified as Mahinda IV, claims to have repaired the bronze work of the Ruvanapahā (Ratanapāsāda) at the Mahāvihāra.[7]

Apart from references to restorative work, the chronicles and the inscriptions contain mention of the substantial additions made during this period to the number of buildings at the monastery. Udaya II as well as Sena and Rakkha, generals of Kassapa IV (898-914) and of Dappula IV (V) (914-935) respectively, built dwellings for monks at the Thūpārāma.[8] At the main monastery, Sena I (833-853) built the Saṅghasena hermitage.[9] Kuṭṭhaka, a general of Sena V, built the Senasenāpati hermitage.[10] General Sena mentioned above added the Samuddagiri hermitage.[11] The chief scribe

---

[1] Cv., 51.128; 54.42.

[2] For an explanation of this term see pp.77-83.

[3] Cv., 51.69, 71.

[4] Pjv., p.103.

[5] Cv., 51.78.

[6] Cv., 52.27.

[7] EZ Vol. I p.222 l.23.

[8] Cv., 51.129; 52.16; 53.11.

[9] Cv., 50.70.

(cont.)

of Kassapa IV, also called Sena, built the Mahālekhapabbata hermitage.[1] Mahinda IV is credited with the construction of the Māra wall near the Mahāthūpa.[2] Prolific building activity, vouched for by these references, is convincing proof of the patronage of the kings and the nobility that the Mahāvihāra enjoyed up to the end of the tenth century.

The long period of neglect and the plunder of monuments for material to set up new buildings have left little of the precincts of the Mahāvihāra. The thirteen groups of buildings unearthed by archaeological excavation are an impressive collection; but they seem to fall behind the ruins of the Abhayagiri monastery in extent. Commenting on one of these ruins, Bell declared, 'Judged by its basement-ruins, no more handsome specimen of this type of shrine was ever erected at Anurādhapura'.[3] The dating and the identification of these ruins present a very difficult problem. The only ruin which can be identified with some degree of confidence is the Loha-pāsāda. Further, the information gathered from the excavations which were of the horizontal type is too meagre to throw adequate light on the history of the monastery.

Two other monasteries at Anurādhapura, the Mariccavaṭṭi and the

---

(cont.)

[10] Cv., 51.88.

[11] Cv., 52.21.

---

[1] Cv., 52.33.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.222 l.28.

[3] See ARASC 1895 pp.2-4; 1897 pp.1-3; 1898 pp.1-3; 1900 pp.1-4; 1901 pp.1-5.

Isuramenu (Issarasamana), are known to have come under the leadership of the Mahāvihāra nikāya. The Mariccavaṭṭi monastery, the repository of the Hair relic, was founded by Duṭṭhagāmaṇī between the Abhaya and the Tissa tanks.[1] Kassapa II (650-659) built a dwelling at the site.[2] But the monastery seems to have suffered from lack of patronage until the reign of Kassapa V when it was found in a dilapidated condition. Kassapa rebuilt the monastery and granted it to five hundred monks of the Theriya faction after endowing it with 'maintenance villages'.[3] According to the Cūlavaṃsa, Mahinda IV built the Candanapāsāda for the Hair relic.[4] In a tenth-century inscription, a king, identified as Mahinda IV, claims to have built the Raksā shrine for the same relic.[5] The chronicle also alludes to the existence of a literary work dealing with the history of the relic, called the Kesadhātuvaṃsa.[6] But the Hair relic does not seem to have enjoyed as much popularity as the Tooth and Bowl relics.[7]

The present ruins of the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery which cover an area of about fifty acres comprise, apart from single buildings, fourteen groups of monastic buildings arranged on three sides of the stūpa, leaving the

---

[1] Mv., ch. 26; Cv., 54.40-41; EZ Vol. I p.22 l.34.

[2] Cv., 44.149.

[3] Cv., 52.45, 46.

[4] Cv., 54.40.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.222 l.34.

[6] Cv., 39.56.

[7] See pp.326-329.

north open. Bell surmised that there would have been four groups on each of the three sides according to the original arrangement: Groups A and J were later additions. He also suggested the identification of the central structure in group A with the dwelling erected by Kassapa II. But this would imply that most of the ruins date back to a period earlier than the seventh century.[1] It seems more reasonable to presume that many of the ruins should date from the reign of Kassapa V. The absence of any inscriptions datable to this period and the unscientific nature of the excavations, however, make it impossible to substantiate this position or to arrive at any other reliable dating.

An inscription records an interesting episode from the ninth year of the reign of Mahinda IV (964 A.D.) when the chief preceptor of the Mahāvihāra nikāya led a deputation of monks from the Isuramenu-Bo-Upulvan-Kasubgiri monastery to present to the king, matters concerning a dispute they had with royal officials over the rights of the monastery to water from the Tisā tank.[2] As evident from the location of the inscription, this monastery, variantly called Isuramenu, Issarasamaṇa or Kassapagiri, was situated in the area to the east of the Tissa tank, known at present by the misnomer Vessagiriya. It was patronized in the seventh century by Jeṭṭhatissa III and Dāṭhopatissa II.[3] Three centuries later, Mahinda IV built a large mansion

[1] ARASC 1902 pp. 3-6; 1903 pp.1-5; 1906 pp.2-8 and plans.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.33 11.8-13.

[3] Cv., 44.98; 45.27.

at the site.[1] It is clear from the inscription cited above that this monastery, represented today by ruins of unpretentious proportions varying from caves bearing pre-Christian inscriptions to buildings which, like some of the inscriptions at the site, may date from the last few centuries of the first millennium, belonged to the Mahāvihāra nikāya.

The Abhayagiri monastery, situated to the north of the city, was built by Vaṭṭagāmaṇī (89-77 B.C.) for a monk called Mahātissa. This monk was later accused by the monks of the Mahāvihāra of a breach of discipline and was expelled from the Order. It is not improbable that the popularity of Mahātissa and the favoured treatment he received from the king aroused the jealousy of his fellow monks. It may be noted that the accusation levied against him was that he 'frequented lay families (kula-samsaṭṭha)'. At least there were some monks who disagreed with the decision to expel Mahātissa. His disciple, also known as Tissa, rose in protest against the treatment meted out to his teacher and left the Mahāvihāra to form a rival faction at the Abhayagiri monastery.[2]

The origin of the term Dharmarucika is uncertain. According to the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, the disciples of the monk Dharmaruci of the Vajjiputra nikāya (Vātsīputrīya) came from the Pallarārāma in India to live with the monks who broke away from the Mahāvihāra. The latter accepted their teaching and were themselves called Dhammarucikas.[3] The authenticity of this story

[1] EZ Vol. I p.222 l.27.

[2] Mv., 33.78-83, 95-98; Niks. p.14-15.

[3] Niks. p.13. Though Pallarārāma may well be held to be a corrupt version of Pallavarāma, it is of too early a date to connect it with the Pallavas.

which appears only in a fourteenth-century literary work is not beyond doubt. It is also possible, as Bareau[1] has pointed out, that this term, which may be interpreted as 'those who take pleasure in the dhamma' or 'those who cause the dhamma to shine', was a name adopted by the members of the nikāya themselves.

The account in the chronicles of the origin of the Abhayagiri monastery tends to suggest that the first schism in the Sinhalese saṅgha was a result of personal differences and differences over disciplinary matters rather than a disagreement over points of doctrine. By the third century, however, 'heretical teachings' found acceptance among the residents of the Abhayagiri monastery.[2] Vohārika Tissa is said to have suppressed the Vetullavāda at the Abhayagiri monastery.[3] But these teachings had revived by the reign of Goṭhābhaya (249-262 A.D.) who banished from the Island sixty monks who professed the Vetullavāda.[4] In the reign of Aggabodhi I (571-604), an Indian monk called Jotipāla defeated the followers of this school in debate; but even as late as the time of Parakkamabāhu I, the monks of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana monasteries are described as followers of the Vetullavāda.[5]

---

[1] Bareau, op.cit., p.242.

[2] For a discussion on the views of the Abhayagiri school, see pp.515-529.

[3] Niks. p.14.

[4] Mv., 36.111-112; Niks. p.15.

[5] Cv., 42.35. 78.20-23.

The Abhayagiri monastery greatly benefited from the patronage of Mahāsena who enlarged it at the expense of the Mahāvihāra. Later on it was vested with the custodianship of the Tooth and Bowl relics. Its liberal attitude towards the teachings of the non-Theravāda schools of Buddhism would have helped it to gain adherents and expand under the patronage of the successors of Mahāsena. By the time of the visit of Fa-Hian, it is reported to have had five thousand monks living within its precincts as against the three thousand at the Mahāvihāra. Fa-Hian states that its stūpa was 470 ft. in height. By the side of the stūpa was a large shrine in the middle of which stood a figure of the Buddha, 22 ft. in height. Fa-Hian also adds that the Bo-tree at the Abhayagiri monastery was brought as a sapling from India, like the more well known tree at the Mahāvihāra.[1]

The chronicles as well as the inscriptions testify to the extensive patronage that the Abhayagiri monastery enjoyed in the ninth and the tenth centuries. Sena I built within its precincts the Vīrankurārāma and extended his patronage to the Uttarāḷha and Kappūra fraternities as well.[2] The lead given by the king was followed by the queen and the courtiers and as a result four new hermitages - the Mahindasena, Uttarasena, Vajirasena and the Rakkhasa - were added to the monastery.[3] Sena II restored the image-house.[4] His queen prepared a diadem-jewel for the image and also built the Saṅgha-

[1] Beal, Chinese accounts of India pp. 46-7.

[2] Cv. 50.68, 77.

[3] Cv. 50.79, 83-84.

[4] Cv., 51.77.

senapabbata hermitage endowed with a good source of income.[1] Kassapa IV repaired the stūpa and built a dwelling named after himself.[2] The Dhammārāma was built by his general.[3] The next king, Kassapa V, erected the Silāmeghapabbata and Bhaṇḍika hermitages and attended to the repairs of the shrine of the Bo-tree.[4] Sena III (938-946) paved the courtyard round the stūpa.[5] Both the stūpa and the shrine of the Bo-tree had to be restored again in the time of Mahinda IV who also claims to have repaired the roof of the dwelling erected by king Kassapa, built the Pusarbā dwelling and adorned the figure of Mahinda with eyes of rubies and a net of gold for the feet.[6] The last statement would suggest that like the monks of the Mahāvihāra, the followers of the Abhayagiri claimed a close association and perhaps direct descent from the thera Mahinda.

The Abhayagiri monastery is described in glowing terms in an inscription of the tenth century which mentions that a certain Mahadāmi was the chief monk of the nikāya at the time. According to this record, the Abhayagiri monastery was a repository of scholars of great wisdom endowed with the virtues of temperance, contentment and religious austerity. These monks were always engaged in literary pursuits. They were ready to sacrifice their lives for the preservation of the sāsana and strove to observe the precepts and to eliminate passion with fear even of the most trivial of trans-

[1] Cv., 51.86-87.

[2] Pjv., p.103; Cv., 52.13.

[3] Cv., 52.17.

[4] Cv., 52.58.

[5] Cv., 53.33.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.221 11.13-15.

gressions.[1]

The popularity and the extent of the Abhayagiri monastery, vouched for by literary and epigraphic sources, are amply confirmed by archaeological evidence.[2] The ruins unearthed by horizontal excavations reveal a monastery which is the largest in extent in the whole Island and is constituted of a complex assortment of buildings crowded all round the main stūpa into an area covering more than three hundred acres. Of most of the buildings not more than the foundations remain. But what remains reveals a complex arrangement ofmany groups of symmetrically placed buildings, each enclosed within a boundary wall and with a well-built stone porch guarding the entrance from the street. This reminds one of the definition of a parivena, in the Sāratthadīpanī, as a site enclosed within its own boundary walls but situated within a mahāvihāra.[3] On the basis of this definition, the groups of buildings mentioned above may be identified as parivenas belonging to the Abhayagiri monastery.

One of the most prominent ruins at the site is a large rectangular stylobate with a bay at the back.[4] Originally it seems to have had two hundred and sixty eight pillars the huge proportions of which earned for the ruin the modern misnomer, 'The Elephants' Stables'. The size of the pillars suggests that it rose to several stories. It seems to have been

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.221 ll.9-13.

[2] ARASC 1891 p.21; 1894 p.3; 1910-1911 pp. 6-16; 1911-1912 pp.1-28.

[3] Sāratthadīpanī (Devarakkhita ed., 1914) p.510.

[4] MASC Vol. I pp.1-18.

roofed with 'bright blue glazed tiles of which numerous fragments were found in the excavations'. A staircase outside the first storey led to the upper floors. Ayrton made the plausible suggestion that it should be identified with the Ratanapāsāda built originally by Kaṇiṭṭha Tissa (167-185) and rebuilt in the eighth century by Mahinda II.[1]

The hermitage to the north of the Abhayagiri stūpa is one of the best preserved of the monastic complexes.[2] It was surrounded by a double wall of longitudinally placed large granite slabs. From the porch, a pathway led northwards up to a sunken quadrangle supporting a pañcāyatana. Access could be gained to the quadrangle also through the two smaller entrances on either side of the main entrance. To the left of the pathway, in the area between the porch and the quadrangle, was a rectangular structure 64 ft. by 47 ft., supported by seventy two pillars. Inside it was a paved space 28 ft. by 10 ft. 8 ins. sunk 2 ft. below the floor level. Bell calls it a 'bath-house'. Directly opposite it and to the right of the path is the stylobate of a building 58 ft. by 37 ft. 6 ins. with three entrances and forty columns evidently designed to support a heavy superstructure. The main building of the pañcāyatana measures 67 ft. by 46 ft. and had thirty twocolumns. The four annexes were each 30 ft. square and sixteen-columned. Of the minor ruins scattered outside the quadrangle, the most significant seems to have been a stūpa to which access was gained through a flight of

[1] Mv., 36.7; Cv., 48.135-6.

[2] ASC Thirteenth Report Pl. XXIV

steps on the northern boundary of the quadrangle. It is important that the voussoir bricksat the site of this ruin are numbered in a script which seems to belong to the tenth century; it throws some light on the possible date of this group of buildings.

As in the case of the sites mentioned earlier, the techniques adopted in the excavations of this time did not attain a standard of precision that would enable the student to distinguish different levels of occupation at the monastery. But a number of inscriptions found at the site, like the scribblings on the voussoir bricks, belong to the ninth and tenth centuries. Two inscriptions datable to the second half of the tenth century were found near the 'stone canoe' by the Outer Circular Road, to the west of the main stūpa.[1] An inscription of a king identified as Kassapa V was found by the 'stone canopy' to the north of the 'stone canoe'.[2] Another tenth-century inscription was discovered in the area described as Section III of the monastic grounds.[3] More recently a number of granite tablets with Sanskrit inscriptions of the ninth century were found to the south-west of the main stūpa.[4] Two more Sanskrit inscriptions, dated respectively to the first half of the ninth century and to the tenth century, were discovered during the excavations in the Kapārārāma area.[5] The discovery of these records leads one to suppose that most of the ruins unearthed reflect the extent of

[1] EZ Vol. I pp.213, 230.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.41.

[3] ARASC 1911-1912 p.35.

[4] ARASC 1940-1945 p.41.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.1; Vol. V Pt. I p.162.

the Abhayagiri monastery during the ninth and the tenth centuries.

During the reign of Mahāsena, the monastery of the Cetiyapabbata came under the control of the Dhammarucikas.[1] The establishment of their influence at one of the oldest seats of Buddhism, hallowed by its association with Mahinda, would have been an important stage in their rise to importance. In the sixth century, an attempt was made by king Dhātusena to hand over the Ambatthala stūpa at the Cetiyapabbata to the Theriyas; but the Dhammarucikas successfully dissuaded him from doing so.[2] The monastery was patronized during the period under consideration by Sena II who built a hospital and Kassapa IV who erected a Hadayuṇha hermitage within its premises.[3]

The Cetiyagiri monastery which squats on the Ambatthala hill spreads over two nearby hills, the Rājagiri-lena-kanda and the Ānaikuṭṭi-kanda on to the valley below. At the time of Fa-hian's visit, the Cetiyagiri monastery is reported to have supported two thousand monks.[4] A hermitage in Buddannehāla,[5] forty-five miles to the north-east of Anurādhapura, was a dependent institution under its control; but the Cetiyagiri monastery was itself under the supervisory control of the Abhayagiri monastery. The

---

[1] Mahāvihāre pāpena mahāsenena nāsite
vasiṃsu dhammarucikā bhikkhu cetiyapabbate Cv., 38.75.
Geiger's translation, which does not take into consideration the true significance of the Locative Absolute construction of this strophe, does not seem to be accurat e. Cv., trsl. Vol. I p.37.

[2] Cv., 38.76.

[3] Cv., 51.73; 52.18.

[4] Beal, op.cit., p.48.

[5] EZ Vol. I pp.191-200.

extensive land endowments made to the Cetiyagiri monastery and the administrative arrangements made to manage them will be discussed in due course.[1]

According to the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya,[2] three hundred monks who did not want to associate themselves with the teachings of the Vetullavāda upheld by the Dhammarucikas broke away in the time of Goṭhābhaya (249-262) under the leadership of a certain Ussiliyā Tissa and took up residence at the Dakkhiṇārāma. The date given for the separation in the Vaṃsatthapakāsanī and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya would give the year 249 A.D.[3] Unlike the former schism, this schism seems to have been precipitated by differences in doctrinal inclination. However, the monks of this faction who left the Abhayagiri monastery due to their opposition to the Vetullavāda are said to have become the supporters of this same school at a later time.[4] The followers of this faction came to be known as Sāgalikas after Sāgala, one of their number who gained fame as an expositor of the dhamma.[5] Confirmation of this last statement is found in a tenth-century inscription from the premises of the Jetavana monastery which refers to Sāguli as the monk after whom the nikāyawas named.[6] Geiger believed that the name Sāgala was

---

[1] See p.

[2] Niks. p.14.

[3] According to both these works, the schism took place 558 years after the establishment of Buddhism. This would give the year 795 of the Buddhist era current at the time which is approximately A.D. 249. Vap. pp.175-6; Niks. pp.14-15.

[4] Niks. p.19. See also p528 n.6

[5] Niks. 14.

[6] EZ Vol. III pp.226-9.

possibly connected with the city of this name in North-western India, which is mentioned in the Milindapañhā as the capital of king Milinda (Menander).[1]

In the fourth century, Mahāsena built the Jetavana monastery with a stūpa which came to be the largest in the Island and bestowed it on the thera Tissa of this fraternity. This monk, who is reviled in the Mahāvaṃsa in the most opprobrious of terms, was accused of a severe breach of discipline (antimavatthu) and the minister who held an inquiry into it expelled him from the Order albeit the wishes of the king.[2] The later followers of the nikāya, obviously, did not share the view of the chroniclers on the character of the founder of their leading monastery. Tissa is described in the inscription cited above as a virtuous ascetic who was content and moderate in his desires.[3]

During the ninth and the tenth centuries, the Jetavana monastery was patronized by several kings though not to the same extent as the other two nikāyas. Sena I, who rebuilt the Mahāparivena which had been burnt down, also erected a new dwelling and installed a gold image of the Buddha in it.[4] Sena II placed figures of bodhisattvas in the Maṇimeḍhalā-pāsāda which was destroyed later by Coḷa invaders. The task of restoration was undertaken by Udaya IV and completed by Mahinda IV.[5] The latter was also responsible

[1] CCMT p.185.

[2] Mv. 37.32, 33, 38, 39.

[3] EZ Vol. III p.227 ll.5-7.

[4] Cv., 50.65-67.

[5] Cv., 51.77; 53.51; 54.48; EZ Vol. I p.227.

for the restoration of the Diyasen house which was used for the performance of the rites connected with the uposatha ceremony.[1] An important addition to the monastery was the Kassapa hermitage built by the general Sena Ilanga in the reign of Kassapa IV.[2] Four officials of Mahinda IVadded four hermitages.[3]

A site enclosed within a boundary wall, containing about fifteen groups of buildings in addition to an alms-hall and a number of image-houses, all clustered round the main stūpa, represent the Jetavana monastery today.[4] At least five of these groups were of the pañcāyatana type. Three more, G, H and J, followed a similar arrangement but had only two instead of four annexes. Among the more important ruins at the site was the large building which bears a striking resemblance to the Ratanapāsāda, in its plan. It measures 109 ft. by 60 ft. and like the Ratanapāsāda it has a wide bay at the back and a group of large columns, each about 2 ft. square, which were probably intended to carry many upper stories.

In the main ruin in group F, the Jetavana monastery possessed one of the most impressive image-houses found at Anurādhapura.[5] It seems to have been a shrine with a vaulted roof, the mainchamber of which measured 69 ft. square with a vestibule 32 ft. square. Its walls which were 5 ft thick were

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.227.

[2] Cv., 52.17.

[3] Cv., 54.49.

[4] ARASC 1892 pp.1-3; 1893 pp.1-5; 1894 pp.1-2.

[5] ASC Tenth Report Pl. VII.

pierced by seventeen windows. The main chamber had a circumambulatory passage round the inner sanctum which contained the image. At present, only the pedestal which is 12 ft. square remains of the image. Bell calculated from the size of the pedestal that the image would have risen to about 18 ft. 6 ins. in height. The vestibule could be entered through the main entrance on the east or through a side entrance on the north. It is interesting that the monolithic door-jambs of the main entrance measure 26 ft. in height. Such a large doorway would have afforded for the faithful a good view of the colossal image in the shrine.

Two inscriptions from the fourth and the tenth centuries have been found at the site of the monastery.[1] Taken as a whole, the Jetavana monastery compares very poorly with the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri in extent; it does not seem to have enjoyed a position comparable to those of the other two schools in the religious life of the people.

Certain passages in the chronicles tend to suggest that there were more than three nikāyas in the Sinhalese saṅgha. One such passage occurs in the description of the meritorious deeds of Aggabodhi IV, in the Cūlavaṃsa:

> tathā dvinnaṃ nikāyānaṃ vihāre maṇḍapaccaye
> disvāpi ca sutvā va bhogagāme bahu adā
>
> bahunā kiṃ nu vuttena nikāyesupi tīsupi
> adā gāmasahassaṃ so bahuppadaṃ nirākulaṃ[2]

It may be inferred that the reference to two nikāyas in the first strophe implies the existence of two nikāyas as distinct fromthe three nikāyas

[1] EZ Vol. III pp.226-9; Vol. IV pp.273-85.

[2] Cv., 46.15-6.

mentioned in the second. In fact, Geiger has suggested that these be identified with the Thūpārāma and the Mariccavaṭṭi monasteries.[1] The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya and the Daḷadāpūjāvaliya mention the Dharmaruci, Sāgali and the Vaitulyavādi among the nikāyas involved in the 'purification' of the saṅgha in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.[2] This would imply that with the Mahāvihāra there were four nikāyas in all.

However, the Thūpārāma and the Mariccavaṭṭi monasteries, as we have pointed out earlier, were dependent institutions of the Mahāvihāra nikāya and are nowhere referred to as independent nikāyas. It is quite possible that the first strophe refers to the two main nikāyas - the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri while all the three nikāyas are mentioned in the second. As to the second instance, it may be pointed out that the Mahāvaṃsa and the Cūlavaṃsa mention that the Vetullavāda was a body of 'heretical teachings' accepted by certain monks of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana monasteries.[3] There is no reason to believe that those who accepted these teachings formed a separate organization. The Vaṃsatthapakāsanī sets all the doubts raised by these two passages at rest by categorically stating that there were no other nikāyas among the Sinhalese saṅgha apart from the three mentioned in the Mahāvaṃsa.[4] This is confirmed by lists in the Indian and Tibetan works quoted earlier which refer to the Jetavanīyas,

---

[1] Cv., trsl. Vol. I p.99 n.2.

[2] Niks. p.25; Daḷadāpūjāvaliya p.61.

[3] For a detailed discussion, see pp.476, 479-480, 528 n.6.

[4] Vap. pp. 175-6.

Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins as the three divisions of the saṅgha of Ceylon.[1]

There is no evidence to suggest that during the first few centuries of their history these three monasteries represented anything more than rival factions of the community of monks living at Anurādhapura. The expansion of the nikāyas depended on the acquisition of other monasteries under their control. Some of these monasteries would have been granted by patrons while others may have been founded by monks of the main monastery. It is only in the fifthcentury that an instance is found of a monastery outside the environs of Anurādhapura being granted to one of the three factions. Mahānāma (406-428) granted to the Mahāvihāra a monastery built on the Dhūmarakkha mountain on the southern bank of the river Mahavāli.[2] Dhātusena (455-574) granted eighteen monasteries to the same nikāya.[3] Of these the Kālavāpi monastery was identified by Geiger as the present Avukana monastery; but Nicholas has located it at Vijitapura in the Kalāgam Palāta of the Anurādhapura district.[4] The name suggests that it would have been close to the Kālavāpi tank. Geiger was also inclined to believe that Dakkhiṇāgiri was the same as the present Mulkirigala in the Southern Province.[5] But an inscription from Kaḷudiyapokuṇa in the Matale

---

[1] See p.18.

[2] Cv., 35.213.

[3] Cv., 38.45-51.

[4] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.166.

[5] Cv trsl. Vol. I p.33 n.3.

district identifies the ruined monastery at the site with the Dakiṇagiri-vehera.[1] Nicholas has located the Paṇṇavallakabhūta monastery in the Polonnaruva district, and the Dhātusenapabbata monastery and the Pācina-kambaviṭṭhi monastery in the Nuvaragam Palāta of the Anurādhapura district; but he has not given any reasons for these identifications.[2] According to the chronicle, three of the monasteries - Maṅgana, Thūpavaḍḍhiṭṭhi and Dhātusena - were in the north (uttare). Nicholas believed that they were in the present Jaffna district.[3] However, the Uttaradesa possibly extended further south than the present Jaffna district. It is not possible to determine the exact location of these places. Dāyagāma, Sālavāna, Vibhīsana and Bhillavāna monasteries were in Rohaṇa. If the last is the same as the Bilavana monastery which occurs in a fourth-century inscription from Karambagala,[4] it may be located in the Hambantoṭa district. It is not possible to locate or identify the other monasteries like Vaḍḍha, Bhallātaka, Antaramegiri, Aṭṭālidhātusena, Kassapiṭṭhidhātusena and Koṭipassāva.

Apparently not all of these monasteries were built by Dhātusena; the monasteries of Dakkhiṇāgiri and possibly Bhillavāna and Koṭipassāva were merely rebuilt. The Mahāvaṃsa records that the Dakkhiṇāgiri monastery was built by Saddhātissa (137-119 B.C.).[5] The Bilavana monastery was known in

[1] EZ Vol. III p. 258 ll. A5-6, p.264 l.10.

[2] JRASCB(NS) pp. 154, 159.

[3] Ibid., p.84.

[4] AIC No. 21a, JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p. 67.

[5] Mv., 33.7.

the time of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328 A.D.). Koṭipassāva, if it is identical with the Koṭipassāvana granted by Mahānāma to the Abhayagiri monastery,[1] is an interesting case. For it implies that Dhātusena restored a monastery which belonged to the Abhayagiri nikāya and granted it to the Mahāvihāra. This would not be surprising as he tried to do something quite similar at the Cetiyapabbata.[2] It is, however, possible that it was desolate monastery that Dhātusena restored. Despite the similarity of names, it is also possible, though very unlikely, that they were two monasteries within the same village.

The last grant recorded in the chronicle is from the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914). His general, Rakkha, built a monastery in the village Savāraka and granted it to the Mahāvihāravāsins.[3] It is not possible to determine the location of this village.

Inscriptions provide more information on the spread of the monasteries belonging to the Mahāvihāra nikāya. A record from Polonnaruva[4] dated in the eighth year of a king Sirisaṅgbo, identified as Mahinda IV, refers to the Kuḷu Tisarad Mahavehera in the Eastern Quarter as belonging to the Mahāvihāra nikāya. It is probably identical with the Kūṭatissa monastery patronized by Sena II.[5] The record goes on to add that a hermitage in the village Kiṇigama belonged to the Kuḷu Tisarad monastery. Nicholas has pointed out

---

[1] Cv., 37.212.

[2] See p.31

[3] Cv., 52.31.

[4] EZ Vol. II pp.49-57.

[5] Cv., 51.74.

that there is a modern Kiṇigama in the Laggala Pallēsiya Pattu.[1]

A tenth-century inscription from Mayilagastoṭa[2] refers to a hermitage called the Uḍatis Pirivena which belonged to the Mahaveher Nakā. Wickremasinghe believed that it refers to a hermitage belonging to the Mahāvihāra nikāya. An inscription of Dappula IV from Kataragama[3] records an endowment made to the Kapugam hermitage described as mahaveher nakā uvaisā pihiṭi. Paranavitana translated this passage as 'situated in the vicinity of the monastery Mahaveher'. He suggests that the Mahaveher Nakā is identical with the Tissa Mahāvihāra at Mahāgāma. If Paranavitana's interpretation is accepted, it may be suggested that the hermitages mentioned in both these inscriptions belonged to the Tissārāma monastery at Mahāgāma. But his is not the only possible interpretation. It is also possible to translate the passage from the Kataragama inscription as indicating that the Kapugam hermitage was a dependent institution within the Mahāvihāra nikāya. The evidence cited above is sufficient to show that the hermitages and monasteries owing allegiance to the Mahāvihāra nikāya were spread all over the Island, as far as Dakkhiṇāgiri in the central highlands, Bhillivāna possibly in the Hambantoṭa district in the south, the environs of Polonnaruva in the east and northwards from Anurādhapura into Uttaradesa.

Unfortunately much less information is available on the other two

---

[1] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.184.

[2] EZ Vol. II pp.57-63.

[3] EZ Vol. III pp.219-225.

nikāyas. Mahānāma built three monasteries - Lohadvāra, Ralaggāma and Koṭipassāvana for the Abhayagiri nikāya,[1] but it is not possible to locate them. Apparently, Sīgiri was a stronghold of the Dharmaruci and Sāgalika nikāyas. A monastery built in the Niyyanti park at Sīgiri was granted to the Dhammarucis even in the lifetime of Kassapa I (473-491).[2] Moggallāna I gave the Daḷha and the Daṭhākoṇḍañña monasteries built at the site to the Dhammarucikas and the Sāgalikas.[3] But in a tenth-century record from the Abhayagiri monastery, the Sīgiri-mahasā is mentioned as belonging to the Mirisaviṭivehera (Mariccavaṭṭivihāra).[4] This raises two possibilities. The hermitages at Sīgiri could have been granted to the Mahāvihāra by a later king, after a period of dilapidated and desolate existence. The other alternative is more plausible. We noticed that two hermitages belonging to Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyaswere found at Sīgiri. It is quite possible that a third was built for the Mahāvihāra, too. It has also to be stated that the record is too fragmentary to support any decisive conclusion. In the reign of Aggabodhi II (604-614), the Veluvana monastery was built for the Sāgalī nikāya.[5] In addition to Sīgiri, there were monasteries which accepted the leadership and the supervisory control of the Abhayagiri mon-

[1] Cv., 37.272.

[2] Cv., 39.14-5.

[3] Cv., 39.41.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.222 l.28.

[5] Cv., 42.43.

astery at Kīrā, Pallāya and Sunagrāma;[1] but they are of uncertain location. It has already been mentioned that another hermitage from Buddhannehāla, forty five miles north-east of Anurādhapura, also belonged to the same nikāya.[2]

Unlike in the case of the Mahāvihāra nikāya, it is not possible to state with certainty that the Dharmaruci and the Sāgalika nikāyas were also spread all over the Island. But circumstantial evidence suggests that their influence spread to the far south by the beginning of the period under consideration. Tantric charms and mystic formulae, written on clay tablets in a script dated to about the ninth century, have been found in Monarāgala in the Ūva Province, at Dumbara in the Central Province and at Tangalla in the Southern Province.[3] Colossal figures of bodhisattvas have been found at Buduruvegala in the Ūva and at Vāligama in the Southern Province.[4] It seems not unreasonable to suppose that the penetration of Mahāyānist and Tāntric influences into Rohaṇa and to less accessible terrain in the Malaya came in the wake of the expansion of the influence of the Sāgalī and particularly the Dharmaruci nikāyas rather than of the Mahāvihāra nikāya; but unfortunately no concrete evidence linking these sites with either of the nikāyas is available.

It is evident from the Cūlavaṃsa that at least by the eleventh century

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.4 ll.8-10.

[2] See p.31

[3] CJSG Vol. II p.47.

[4] Ibid., p.49; see also supra p.319.

the three nikāyas were known in Rohaṇa. While describing the work of restoring ruined shrines undertaken by Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110), the chronicle refers to the relic shrines of the three nikāyas at Mahāgāma, destroyed by the Cola invaders.[1] There is little doubt that the influence of the three nikāyaswas definitely established in Rohaṇa after the mass exodus of monks from Polonnaruva, in the reign of Vikkamabāhu I (1111-1132).[2] And in the time of Parakkamabāhu I, monks of the three nikāyas dwelling in Rohaṇa were among the religieux invited by the king to participate in the synod he convened.[3]

Concurrent with this territorial expansion of the three nikāyas was the vertical penetration of their influence into the body of the saṅgha, which resulted in the division of the various minor groups within the clerical community on sectarian lines. From about the sixth century, mention of a certain group of monks called tapassins occur in the Cūlavaṃsa. Mahānāga (569-571) bestowed a thousand fields from Dūratissa for the regular provision of gruel to the tapassins of the Mahāvihāra.[4] The fields were probably in the Polonnaruva district. Aggabodhi I (571-604) built a monastery at Ambilapassāva and granted it together with that village to the tapassins of the same sect.[5] Nicholas has located Ambilapassāva in

---

[1] Cv., 60.56.

[2] Cv., 61.58-61.

[3] Cv., 78.10.

[4] Cv., 41.97.

[5] Cv., 42.17.

the present Vavuniyā district.[1] We hear again of the tapassins in the reign of Kassapa IV, when Sena Ilaṅga, a general, built for them a dwelling on the Rattamālagiri, identified as Ratmale, to the south of Anurādhapura.[2] These three references suggest that the tapassins were spread over a wide area in the Island and that they were probably divided on sectarian lines.

Presumably, the tapassins were monks who practised asceticisms (tapa). The term tapassin has been used in two instances in the Cūlavaṃsa to connote religieux who performed certain ascetic practices listed in the Mahāniddesa. In one instance, it occurs in a context where it seems to have been used to refer to the Pāṃsukūlikas. In another place it occurs in the phrase araññakānaṃ tapassīnaṃ which reveals that the forest-dwelling monks were also referred to by this term.[3] A group of monks who are only once mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa seems to fall into the same category.[4] Vijayabāhu I is said to have provided the vantajīvakas with 'the four priestly requisites'. They seem to have been held in very high esteem. For he granted 'maintenance villages' even to their relatives.

Geiger interpreted the term vantajīvaka as 'one who has thrown away his life';[5] but this carried little sense. It would be more understandable if we accept the reading vattajīvaka found in two of the manuscripts

[1] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.87.

[2] Cv., 52.20; JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.157.

[3] Cv., 54.20.

[4] Cv., 60.69.

[5] CCMT p.203.

of the chronicle. The term vatta occurs in the sense of Sanskrit vrata in early Pali texts like the Dīghanikāya and the Mahāniddesa.[1] In fact, in explaining the term vatta, the Mahāniddesa lists eight ascetic practices (dhutaṅga). On this basis vattajīvin would have meant 'one who devoted his life to the practice of asceticisms'.

Most probably, the monks described as yogins for whom Aggabodhi I built a monastery also fall into this category.[2] Buddhaghosa mentions hatthayoga and pattayoga as two of the modes of performing one of the thirteen ascetic practices - the pattapiṇḍikaṅga.[3] Hence it seems reasonable to assume that all these three terms - tapassin, vattajīvin and yogin - denoted a category of monks who devoted themselves to the performance of ascetic practices (dhutaṅga).

The Pāṃsukūlikas who depended on discarded rags for material for their robes were perhaps the best-known group of ascetics in Ceylon. The Visuddhimagga gives twenty-three types of rags which were permissible for use by the Pāṃsukūlikas. Evidently, strict adherence to rules and principles could not be expected from all the followers of this sect. Buddhaghosa refers to three types of Pāṃsukūlikas - the 'strict', 'moderate' and the 'soft'. According to him, '... he who picks up a rag thrown away in the cremating ground is a strict man. He who picks up a rag which was

---

[1] Dīgha Nikāya (PTS) Vol. III p.9; Mahāniddesa (PTS) Vol. I p.188.

[2] Cv., 42.25.

[3] Vsm. (Warren and Kosambi) p.56.

placed with the verbal expression, "a monk will pick it up", is a moderate man. He who accepts a rag placed at his feet is a soft man.'[1]

A story in the Sahassavatthupakarana mentions Pāṃsukūlika monks who lived in the second century B.C.[2] According to the Manorathapūranī, they took part in the debate which took place among the saṅgha about a century later and held that conduct (paṭipatti) should be given precedence over accomplishment in the scriptures (pariyatti) in the life of monks, in opposition to the Dhammakathikas who argued that accomplishment in the scriptures formed the basis of the sāsana.[3]

The Pāṃsukūlikas occur in the chronicles for the first time in the seventh century. Mānavamma (684-718) built a dwelling at the Thūpārāma for them.[4] His successor, Aggabodhi V (718-724) built four monasteries for the same sect.[5] Of these, the Girinagara monastery at Devapāli and the Rājamātikā monastery have not been located. But the Kadambagona monastery was in Mahāthala, roughly the present Matale district, and the Deva monastery was at Antarasobbha, a ford over the river Mahavāli, somewhere to the north of Mahiyaṅgana. Vajira, a general of Dappula II (815-831), built a monastery for this sect at Kacchavāla.[6] It is probably the same as the Kaccha ford over

[1] Pe Maung Tin, The Path of purity p.72.

[2] Shsvp., p.49.

[3] Manorathapūranī (PTS) Vol. I pp. 92-93.

[4] Cv., 47.66.

[5] Cv., 48.3-4.

[6] Cv., 49.80.

the river Mahavāli. Another large monastery for the Pāṃsukūlikas was built by Sena I at the Ariṭṭhapabbata, the present Riṭigala range of hills in the Hurula Palāta of the Anurādhapura district.[1] A ninth-century inscription from this area, which refers to the Riṭigal monastery built by king Salamevaṇ, confirms the statement in the chronicle.[2] The instances cited above make it clear that the Pāṃsukūlikas were spread over a wide area. They also suggest that groups of Pāṃsukūlika monks tended to live separately in hermitages or buildings of their own even if they were attached to a particular monastery or a nikāya.

The period covered by the reigns of Sena I and II saw a significant development in the history of the Pāṃsukūlikas and their relations with the Abhayagiri nikāya. In the reign of Sena I, a separate kitchen was constructed for the Pāṃsukūlika monks of the Abhayagiri monastery.[3] The separatist tendencies implicit in this seemingly insignificant statement had developed to such an extent by the twentieth regnal year of Sena II (872 A.D.) that the Pāṃsukūlika monks left the Abhayagiri monastery to form a separate group (gaṇāhesuṃ).[4] The abrupt reference in the Cūlavaṃsa does not enable one to form a fair idea of the incident. It is not possible to ascertain the reasons for this separation. Nor is it possible to make a definitive statement on what the separation amounted to. But there is no doubt that

---

[1] Cv., 50.63-64; JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI pp. 171-172.

[2] EZ Vol. III pp.289-294.

[3] Cv 50.76.

[4] tassa vīsatime vasse vihāre abhayuttare
nikkhamitvā gaṇāhesuṃ paṃsukūlikabhikkhavo. Cv. 51.52.

the separation of the Pāṃsukūlikas, who enjoyed immense popularity and were generously patronized from the seventh to the tenth century, would have been detrimental to the prestige of the Abhayagiri nikāya.

Nevertheless the incident itself sheds valuable light on a question of immediate concern to us: the extent of the influence that the three nikāyas wielded on the monks belonging to the Pāṃsukūlika sect. It is quite clear that there were Pāṃsukūlikas at the Mahāvihāra. For, as mentioned earlier, Mānavamma is said to have built a dwelling for them at the Thūpārāma. About three centuries later, Sena Ilaṅga, a general of Kassapa IV, built the Samuddagiri hermitage at the Mahāvihāra for the Pāṃsukūlika monks.[1] This shows clearly that the Pāṃsukūlika fraternity at the Mahāvihāra remained within the folds of its nikāya right into the tenth century. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that the nikāya division cut across the Pāṃsukūlika sect, though there is no mention in any of the sources of a Pāṃsukūlika faction within the Jetavana nikāya.

In this connection, it is significant that in the reign of Vikkamabāhu I (1111-1132), the Pāṃsukūlikas were divided into two factions (koṭṭhāsavayanissitā).[2] On the basis of this information, it is possible to adduce two explanations of the incident which took place in the reign of Sena II. The Pāṃsukūlikas who left the Abhayagiri monastery could have joined either those of the Jetavana nikāya, or less probably, the Mahāvihāra nikāya. But the term gaṇāhesuṃ suggests that they left the Abhayagiri to form an inde-

[1] Cv., 52.21.

[2] Cv., 61.59.

pendent group of their own. Hence it is also possible that it was this group and the Pāṃsukūlikas of the Mahāvihāra who were referred to as 'the Pāṃsukūlikas of the two divisions', in the time of Vikkamabāhu I. The second explanation would imply that there was no Pāṃsukūlika faction within the Jetavana nikāya.

It appears that this lavish patronage the Pāṃsukūlikas enjoyed had a mellowing effect on the severity of their austerities. It is ironical that these monks given to a life of wearing robes made of rags were presented with royal garments in the reign of Aggabodhi V.[1] Aggabodhi VII (772-777) decreed that food fit for royalty be given to them.[2] The monastery of Ariṭṭhapabbata was endowed with extensive resources (mahābhogaṃ) and equipment worthy of royalty (parikkhāraṃ rājārahaṃ). Ārāmikas, slaves and workmen were appointed to attend to their needs.[3] These donations are perhaps an indication of the changes that were taking place in the attitudes of the Pāṃsukūlikas.

Even if the Pāṃsukūlikas were turning into 'soft men' as Buddhaghosa would have called them, this did not dampen the enthusiasm and the devotion of their patrons. They were held in such high regard that even their kinsmen were honoured. Sena Ilaṅga distributed rice and clothing among the mothers of Pāṃsukūlika monks.[4] Immediately after his success in the campaigns against

[1] Cv., 48.16.

[2] Cv., 48.73.

[3] Cv. 50.63, 64.

[4] Cv., 52.27.

the Colas, Udaya IV (V) (946-954) distributed priestly requisites bought at considerable cost among the Pāṃsukūlika monks.[1] Mahinda IV regularly entertained them to alms at his palace. Further he presented them with bowls filled with garlic, black pepper, long pepper, ginger, molasses, myrobalan, clarified butter, oil and honey, and distributed among them blankets, carpets, robes and other requisites.[2] Their popularity is best exemplified by an incident which took place in the reign of Udaya III when the people rose in revolt against the king who had violated their traditional privileges.[3]

Ayrton's suggestion that the so-called Western Monasteries in Anurādhapura should be identified with the Tapovana where the hermitages of the Pāṃsukūlikas were situated does not seem to be unreasonable.[4] These ruins are to be found in the area traversed by the Outer Circular and Arippu Roads, to the west of the city. They comprise several groups of buildings, each enclosed within a double stone-wall and entered through a porch of handsome proportions, all executed in a distinctive architectural style. The characteristic which distinguishes this type of monastery from others discussed so far is that it has as its central feature one or more specimens of a structure consisting of two stone-faced platforms connected

---

[1] Cv., 53.48.

[2] Cv., 54.18, 19, 23-35.

[3] See p.296.

[4] MASC Vol. I pp. 18-48.

by a monolithic 'bridge'. Ayrton surmised that the first of these platforms would have been left open and was perhaps surrounded by a half-wall. Presumably, the second platform had a flat roof. The second platform was always situated on the hummock of a rock and its foundations were built in such a way that there was a moat surrounding the platform, over the bare face of the rock. All round these double platforms are found an odd assortment of buildings the functions of which are recognisable only in the case of image-houses and of privies. The whole monastic complex is noteworthy for the severe austerity of its execution. Dressed slabs, sometimes sparsely ornamented, were used in its construction. Oddly enough, the only instance of lavish ornamentation is seen in the workmanship of the urinal-slabs of the privies.[1]

It has already been pointed out that these ruins situated about two to three miles from the city are considerably different from the usual type of monastery in point of style and layout. It is also significant that ruins of the double platform type have been found at the Riṭigala hills where Sena I built a monastery for the Pāṃsukūlikas. These facts add strength to Ayrton's suggestion though there is no direct evidence to substantiate it.

Remains of similar buildings have also been found at Mullesgala, Mānākanda, Veherabāndigala, Sivalukanda, Galbāndivihāre, Māṇikdena and Nuvaragalkanda.[2] As Ayrton remarked, all these sites need not necessarily have been associated with Pāṃsukūlika monks.[3] It may also be added that

---

[1] Hocart's explanation that the excretory functions of the monks were considered to be a holy rite amounts to little more than fanciful imagination. See MASC Vol. I p.56.

[2] MASC Vol. I p.43.

[3] Ibid., p. 47.

the Pāṃsukūlikas were not necessarily confined to monasteries of this type.

The Pāṃsukūlikas find mention again in the time of Vikkamabāhu I. They joined the monks of the eight mūlavihāras of Polonnaruva to leave for Rohaṇa in protest against the confiscation of monastic property by the king.[1] But this time they walked out of the capital into oblivion and are never again mentinned in the historical sources of Ceylon.

The Āraññika or the monk who dwelt in the woods has been a familiar figure among the saṅgha from the earliest days of Buddhism. It is hard to draw a clear distinction between the Pāṃsukūlikas and the Āraññika as there would have been monks who practised both these forms of asceticism.[2] A certain Vanavāsī Mahātissa occurs in the commentaries of Buddhaghosa.[3] But it is only in the tenth century that a specific reference is made to the Āraññika, in the chronicles, The Cūlavaṃsa mentions that in the reign of Kassapa IV, Sena Ilaṅga built a dwelling in the woods for the Āraññika monks of the Mahāvihāra and named it after his clan.[4] Devā, the queen of Kassapa V, built a hermitage for the monks who dwelt in the woods, who aredescribed as 'lamps unto the Thera sect'.[5] It is possible to deduce by implication that there would have been Āraññika monks in the other two nikāyas as well; but there is no specific evidence to substantiate it.

---

[1] See p.126

[2] See for example Vinaya Piṭaka Vol. III p.15.

[3] Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (PTS) Vol. I p.189; Papañcasūdanī (PTS) Vol. I p.258.

[4] Cv., 52.22.

[5] Cv., 52.64.

Like the Pāṃsukūlikas, the Āraññikas, too, benefited from the generosity of Mahinda IV. He regularly sent them wholesome food with molasses heated in clarified butter, essence of garlic and betel and delegated physicians to attend to their sick.[1] The attraction that asceticism had for a section of the community of monks and the esteem in which they were held by the laity may, to some extent, reflect a reaction to the monastic way of life as known at the time. But it is possible that the popularity of the Āraññika was due as much to the fame of their scholarship as to their devoted adherence to ascetic ideals. Several of the better-known teachers and commentators of the period under consideration came from this fraternity.[2]

The confiscation of monastic property carried out by Vikkamabāhu I led to an exodus of monks from the main religious establishments to Rohana, but the Āraññika fraternity does not seem to have been affected. A settlement of monks near the Diṃbulāgala range of hills, ten miles to the south-east of Polonnaruva, was patronized by Sundaramahādevī, the queen of Vikkamabāhu I. In an inscription issued in the sixth year of her son's reign Sundaramahādevī describes Diṃbulāgala as the abode of five hundred monks. The shrines of the monastery which were supposed to house relics of the Buddha attracted many pilgrims. The queen had a path constructed between the Hirumahalena and the Saṅdamahalena as it was with the assistance of chains and strenuous effort that people, especially the old folk, had to reach these shrines.[3]

---

[1] Cv., 54.20-22.

[2] See p.216

[3] EZ Vol. II pp. 194-202.

It is interesting that two of the dwellings at the Dimbulāgala monastery were called Kaliṅgulena and Demaḷāpāhā (Damiḷapāsāda). At this time, people from Kaliṅga were quite familiar in Ceylon. There was a well-known clan by this name. The queen herself was from the Kaliṅga country. The reference to the Kaliṅgulena occurs in a fragmentary portion of the reocrd. In a clearer portion, Sundaramahādevī claims to have made endowments to the Demaḷāpahā for the provision of gruel and rice. The names of these two dwellings perhaps indicate the patronage the monks of Dimbulāgala received from both the Kaliṅga and the Draviḍa communities in Ceylon.

Literary sources, especially the Pali works, refer to a place called Udumbarapabbata or Udumbaragiri. The Sahassavatthupakaraṇa mentions the Candamukhalena at the Udumbarapabbata where the thera Maliyadeva once discoursed on the dhamma. It also refers to a certain Udumbaravihāra where the Ariyavaṃsa was preached; but it is not certain whether this is the same as the Udumbarapabbata.[1] According to the Rasavāhinī, monks used to go to Udumbaragiri to practise meditation.[2]

Udumbarapabbata or Udumbaragiri is the exact translation into Pali of the Sinhalese name Dimbulāgala. The Sahassavatthu mentions that the Udumbarapabbata was situated on the way between Anurādhapura and Mahāgāma and suggests that it was close to the river Mahavāli.[3] Candamukhalena is strongly reminiscent of Saṅḍamahalena. Hence it seems quite probable that both these

[1] Shsvp., pp. 120, 183.

[2] Rasavāhinī (Colombo, 1920) Vol. I p.183.

[3] Shsvp., pp. 120, 183.

terms Udumbarapabbata and Dimbulāgala referred to the same place. One objection to this identification would be that the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya mentions the monk Kassapa as belonging to the Audumbaragiri fraternity but refers to Medhaṅkara as a member of the Dimbulāgala fraternity.[1] But this does not invalidate the identification as the author of the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya was wont to use the Sanskrit and Sinhalese forms of a name rather indiscriminately.[2] And in the Padasādhana sannaya, Medhaṅkara mentioned above is described as audumbarābhihita-pabbata-vāsika.[3] This leaves little doubt on the validity of this identificat ion. The monastic settlement at Dimbulāgala which produced some of the leading figures in the organization of the saṅgha in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was perhaps the most important centre of the Araññika sect during this period.

The presence of another separate group of monks is alluded to in a strophe yielding a controversial text and an equally controversial interpretation. Speaking of the meritorious deeds of the queen of Udaya I, the Cūlavaṃsa says:

> kāretvā jayasenaṃ ca pabbataṃ dāmilassadā
> bhikkhusaṅghassa sa gamaṃ mahaummaraṃ ca tass'adā[4]

The last word of the first pāda occurs in six of the manuscripts Geiger consulted as dāmissadā and in the seventh as dāmisassadā. It is evident from

---

[1] Niks . pp.25, 26.

[2] See for instance the use of Paḷābatgala and Puṭabhattasela in p.27.

[3] Padasādhana sannaya (Dharmānanda, 1932) p.303.

[4] Cv., 49.24.

the case ending that this phrase was meant to qualify bhikkhusaṅghassa in the second pāda. But dāmibhikkusaṅgha or dāmisabhikkhusaṅgha carries little sense. Hence it was amended to read gāmikassa by Sumaṅgala and Batuwantudawa in the first edition of the Cūlavaṃsa. Buddhadatta accepted this emendation in his more recent edition of the chronicle. But Geiger's emendation of the phrase to read as dāmilassadā seems to be more appropriate and closer to the original text and gives a more specific sense than the term gāmikass'adā.

The acceptance of Geiger's reading, however, involves the implication of the existence of a community of Dravidian monks as a separate group. For they are said to have been the beneficiaries of a grant of a monastery and of a village. Nicholas believed that the village Mahā-ummāra granted to them should be located between Anurādhapura and the river Mahavāli, in the area presently known as the Kurulu Palāta.[1] There is also an inscription which hints at the possibility of the existence of a separate community of Dravidian monks. A tenth-century record from Vevälkäṭiya in the Kāṇḍā K$_o$rale, twenty-one miles to the north-east of Anurādhapura, refers to the land holdings which belonged to the Demeḷvehera at Kibinilam of the Aṅgam kuliya in the Northern Division.[2] The Demeḷvehera could have been a monastery where Dravidian monks lived, and if so, supports the foregoing assumption. But it is also possible that the monastery received this name for some other reason as if, for instance, it had been built by a Dravidian.

[1] JRASCB (NS) Vol. VI p.173.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.246 ll.6-7.

The Dravidian monk was not an unfamiliar figure in ancient Ceylon. Some monks came from South India to make a significant contribution to the development of Buddhist thought in the Island.[1] But the phrase dāmilabhikkhusaṅgha would point to the not very likely possibility of their existence as a separate community distinct from the main body of the Sinhalese saṅgha. The assumption of the presence of a community of Drāvidian monks leading a separate existence entails the grave implication that the community of monks was divided on racial grounds. Here, we may remark that such an assumption has to be based, as has been demonstrated above, on a weak infrastructure of highly controversial evidence.

Another constituent faction of the clerical community was the order of nuns which, in spite of its interesting history, received little attention from the chroniclers. The Dīpavaṃsa, which provides more information than the Mahāvaṃsa, describes the early nuns as well accomplished in the scriptures and lists the names of those who were prominent in the Order from the earliest times till the reign of Bhātikābhaya (22 B.C. - 7 A.D.)[2] Many of them were drawn from the upper strata of the society. Anulā, the queen of Devānaṃpiyatissa, Mahilā and Samantā, daughters of Kākavaṇṇatissa, and Sivalā and Samuddanāvā who were probably the daughters of Bhātikābhaya, were all prominent nuns in their times. Later on, we hear of the queen of Jeṭṭhatissa III entering the Order on the death of her husband.[3] Similarly

[1] See p.36i f.

[2] Dv., ch. 18.

[3] Cv., 44.114.

the daughter of Aggabodhi VI became a nun to escape maltreatment at the hands of her husband.[1]

The nuns of Ceylon seem to have evinced an extraordinary zeal in missionary enterprise. It was as a result of their endeavours that an Order of nuns was established in China. According to the Chinese annals,[2] eight Sinhalese nuns arrived at Nanking in 426 A.D. Their presence 'inspired Chinese women for the first time, to seek to enter the "Holy Orders".' But ten nuns were required to form a chapter to perform the ceremonyof admission. In 429 three more nuns arrived from Ceylon and women were admitted into the Order of nuns for the first time in the history of Buddhism in China.

According to the Mahāvaṃsa, Mahāsena built two convents called Uttara and Abhaya.[3] Presumably, they were given over to the Abhayagiri nikāya. The Cūlavaṃsa records the construction of a dwelling (upassaya) called Rājinī for the nuns of the Sāgalika nikāya, in the reign of Moggallāna I (491-508).[4] Mahinda II had a silver image of a bodhisattva made for the nunnery called Silāmegha. The queen of Udaya I who made a grant of wealth to this monastery also turned over to its charge another convent she caused to be built.[5] The mention of the image of the bodhisattva could imply, though not necessarily, that the institution belonged to the Abhayagiri or the Jetavana nikāya. The instances cited above consist of a specific reference to a nunnery of the Jetavana nikāya and two more references to

---

[1] Cv., 48.57.

[2] Seng-che-lio, Kao-seng-tchouan and Fo-tsou-t'ong-ki quoted by Pelliot in BEFEO Vol. IV p.356. Translated into English by John M. Seneviratna. See JRASCB Vol. XXIV pp. 107-8.

[3] Mv 37.43. (cont.)

nunneries which possibly belonged to the Abhayagiri or the Jetavana nikāyas.

An inscription from Mahakalattāva,[1] presumably datable to the reign of Kassapa IV, records that Sena, the Chief Scribe, built the Nālārāma named after his mother. He endowed this convent with the village Gitelgamu and charged its inmates with the task of watering and maintaining the Bo-tree at the Mahāvihāra. There is little doubt that it belonged to the Mahāvihāra nikāya. The Cūlavaṃsa records that Sena Ilaṅga built the Tissārāma nunnery during the same reign. The nuns of this institution had the similar task of attending on the Bo-tree at the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery.[2] Evidently, this nunnery, too, housed adherents of the Mahāvihāra nikāya.

The Kukurumahandamana inscription,[3] also dated to the reign of Kassapa IV, mentions the Mahindārāma nunnery which was situated ~~which~~ in the 'inner city' of Anurādhapura. Unfortunately, no information is available on its nikāya affiliations. More specific evidence is found from later reigns. In the time of Kassapa V, Vajirā, the wife of the Sakkasenāpati built a dwelling at the Padalañchana, for the nuns of the Theravaṃsa.[4] Mahinda IV built the Mahāmallaka convent for nuns of the same group.[5]

4(cont.)
4Cv., 39.43.

5Cv., 48.139.

1AIC No. 110.

2Cv., 52.24.

3EZ Vol. II pp.19-25.

4Cv., 52.63.

5Cv., 54.47.

It is evident from the facts cited above that the Order of nuns was divided among the three nikāyas. It is also clear that nuns were by no means rare at Anurādhapura. In fact, some of the dwellings built for them were quite extensive in their proportions. The Jeṭṭhārāma, built by the queen of Aggabodhi IV, for instance, was endowed with three villages and had a hundred ārāmikas attached to it.[1] The Order of nuns persisted right down to the tenth century. It has already been mentioned that Mahinda IV built a convent. In an inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery, a king, also identified as Mahinda IV, claims that he built an alms-hall for nuns and that he repaired the buildings at unendowed nunneries.[2]

But nuns leave the stage of history as quietly as they had occupied it, leaving no trace for the curious historian to determine the causes or the circumstances of their disappearance. It is in the reign of Mahinda IV that they are mentioned for the last time. Perhaps, the troubled years of the Coḷa occupation made survival difficult. In his commentary on the Vinaya, Sāriputta devotes 884 pages for discussing the rules pertaining to the life of monks, but dismisses the section on nuns with a mere 18 pages.[3] If a community of nuns existed in his time, it could be expected that he would have followed the example of his predecessors in devoting much greater attention to this subject. In fact, the experience gathered during the period of political instability which preceded wouldhave underlined the need for a detailed exposition of the rules governing the conduct of nuns.

---

[1] Cv., 46.27,28.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.222 ll.32-3.

[3] Sāratthadīpanī (ed. Devarakkhita), 1914.

Even if the Order of nuns had become extinct in Ceylon by the end of the period of Cola rule, nuns continue to find mention in the inscriptions of Burma. Uiw Pam, a nun, occurs as a witness to a ceremony of dedication in a record dated A.D. 1196.[1] Two inscriptions from the thirteenth century refer to nuns of slave parentage.[2] According to an inscription from the Minwaing Kyaung Enclosure, Minnanthu, Pagan, Uiw Chī Tāw, presumably a nun, was among the eight dignitaries present at a recital of paritta in 1261 A.D.[3] Than Tun suggests that it was probably the same person who occurs as the chief incumbent of a nunnery in 1279 A.D.[4] It appears strange that no attempt was made to restore the Order of nuns in Ceylon with help from the Burmese. Perhaps, the Burmese nuns were not considered by the Ceylonese to be sufficiently 'orthodox' in their views and practices. It is also possible that the revival of the Order of nuns was not considered to be particularly conducive to the well-being of the Order.[5] No evidence is available on this problem and this amazing lack of interest on the part of the saṅgha and the laity to revive the Order of nuns remains inexplicable at the present stage of our knowledge.

The discussion which appears in the preceding pages would help one to form a fair idea of the nature of the three nikāyaswhich formed the main element of the structure of the Buddhist saṅgha of Ceylon. Unlike the sects

---

[1] Luce and Pe Maung Tin - Inscriptions of Burma, Pl. 576A.

[2] Ibid., Pls. 89,92.

[3] Ibid., Pl. 200.

[4] Ibid, Pl. 268; Than Tun, The Buddhist church in Burma during the Pagan Period (unpublished Thesis) pp. 285-286.

[5] The belief that the existence of an Order of nuns had a harmful effect on the sāsana can be traced back to the Canon.

in Tibetan Buddhism, they did not represent provincial interests; they existed side by side in various localities of the Island. Nor were they restricted to particular communities or groups within the clerical society. There is reason to believe that almost all the different groups of religieux mentioned in our historical sources were divided on nikāya lines. Hence it is clear that the nikāya division transcended geographical boundaries and penetrated deep into the clerical community.

It has been mentioned earlier that the attachment of a monastery to a particular nikāya would have involved the adherence of its monks to the interpretation of the Canon and to other views professed by that nikāya. There is no information pointing to a strict control by the main monastery in this respect. The inscription of Kassapa V at the Abhayagiri monastery alludes to the practice of allocating monks trained in the scriptures at the main monastery to fill vacancies at the dependent institutions of the nikāya.[1] This would have to some extent encouraged conformity to the views held by the main monastery. This relationship between the main monastery and its dependent institutions would have come into force mainly in instances of disputes regarding the doctrines or the disciplinary rules. One means recommended in the Vinaya for the solution of disputes was consultation with neighbouring monasteries.[2] It would have been usual to refer disputes to other monasteries of the nikāya or to individual monks known for their learning, for solution. The possibility that some form of consultation between

[1] EZ Vol. I p.48 l.41.

[2] Vinaya Piṭaka Vol. II p.94.

monasteries situated at considerable distances from each other, prevailed as early as about the first century A.D., is evident in the commentaries of Buddhaghosa. The Atthasālinī, for example, quotes extensively with tacit approval the interpretation of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī professed by Mahādhammarakkhita of Rohaṇa and Mahādatta of Moravāpi, though it purports to be an exposition of the views held by the Mahāvihāra.[1] Further, the Visuddhimagga records an instance of a monk from Anurādhapura going to Rohaṇa to acquaint himself with the interpretation of the Canon propounded by the thera Mahādhammarakkhita, mentioned above.[2] These instances make it evident that, at least in the early days, it was not a case of the main monasteries of Anurādhapura giving the lead and impressing their views on the rest. The provincial monasteries would come into prominence when they produced men of scholarly attainment. Their views were accepted even by the monks at the capital. In the case of the Mahāvihāra, the task of ensuring the adherence of the dependent institutions to the teachings of the nikāya would have become easier after the time of Buddhaghosa who compiled and collated the views and interpretations held by various teachers to produce a systematic exposition of the teachings of this nikāya.

However, distance would have been one of the limiting factors on the relationship between the main monastery and the other constituents of the nikāya. It is doubtful whether the main monastery could maintain its super-

[1] Atthasālinī (PTS) pp. 230, 278, 284-6; Moravāpi has been located in the Kurunāgala district. JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.94.

[2] Vsm. pp. 77-78.

visory influence over the monasteries and hermitages situated in the far corners of Rohaṇa and Dakkhiṇadesa. Further, the spread of the three nikāyas over the whole Island does not necessarily mean that all the monasteries came within their fold. Buddhism had penetrated throughout the Island well before nikāya divisions arose and it is possible that some of the early monasteries and hermitages continued to lead an independent existence, evading the polarization witnessed during the period under consideration. The Cūlavaṃsa records the grant that Aggabodhi I (574-604) made of the Kurunda monastery endowed with a vast coconut plantation and numerous attendants to the whole Order of monks (sabbasaṅghikaṃ).[1] If any importance is attached to the last phrase, this particular monastery, unlike many others, granted during this period, seems to have been devoid of affiliation to any one of the nikāyas. It is also possible that the Paṃsukūlikas who broke away from the Abhayagiri nikāya in the time of Sena II existed as an independent group. Hence it is important to remember that the three nikāyas represented the saṅgha only in a general and conventional sense: their presence does not imply a sharp division in the body of the saṅgha on a sectarian basis.

[1] See p. 67.

Chapter 2

THE SANGHA AND ITS PROPERTY

The ideal of the early Buddhist monk, like that of most other ascetics, represented an attempt to stand aloof from the economic and social bonds of normal lay life. It prescribed the rejection of wealth and all forms of economic activity. The monk was to lead a life of poverty and of total dependence on the voluntary donations of the laity. But the rise in number ofmonks and monasteries made adherence to such an ideal no longer practicable. The total dependence of a large number of monks on voluntary donations for their food and clothing was an unsatisfactory arrangement. The monastery needed a stable source of income also for the maintenance of monastic buildings and for the regular performance of its ritual. And among the patrons of the saṅgha were kings and the élite of the society capable of making substantial endowments. This paved the way to the growth of monastic property and brought about a significant change in the attitude of the saṅgha towards wealth.

The Mahāvaṃsa alludes to a land grant made by Thulatthana (119 B.C.) to a monastery called Kandara.[1] Vaṭṭagāmaṇī (103 B.C.) made a similar grant to the hermitage of his benefactor, Kuppikala Mahātissa, and Bhātikābhaya (22 B.C. - 7 A.D.) endowed stūpas with land so that they could be kept in good repair.[2] It is only in the post-Christian

---

[1] Mv., 33.16.

[2] Mv., 33.50; 34.63.

era that grants of irrigation works occur in the Mahāvaṃsa. Āmaṇḍagāmaṇī (19-29 A.D.) granted the Mahāgāmeṇḍi tank to the Dakkhiṇavihāra.[1] Iḷanāga (33-43) donated a tank near Maṇikāragāma to the Issarasamaṇa monastery.[2] Vasabha (67-111) presented the Mucela monastery at Tissavaḍḍhamānaka with the dues from the canal Āḷisāra and also granted a tank irrigating thousand karīsas for the maintenance of lamps at a monastery at Galambhatittha.[3]

Inscriptions confirm the evidence from the chronicle and further reveal that the practice of granting irrigation works was known even from the pre-Christian times. The Dūvegala inscription of Lañjatissa (119-109 B.C.) records the grant of a tank and of land.[4] The Nāulpota inscription, which mentions the grant of a field, and the Galgamuva inscription, which records the grant of a village and of a tank, seem to date from the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇī.[5] Hence we can be fairly certain that the practice of endowing monasteries with land, villages and irrigation works was known by the beginning of the Christian era.[6]

---

[1] Mv., 35.5.

[2] Mv., 35.47.

[3] Mv., 35.47. Karīsa = kiri. The Saddharmaratnāvalī translates the Pali passage aṭṭhakarīsa in the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā as ekyāla doḷosamuṇa (Colombo ed. p.149). As a yāla is equivalent to twenty amuṇas, this would mean that a karīsa was four amuṇas in sowing extent. According to Clough, an amuṇa is about 2-2½ acres. Codrington estimates an amuṇa at one acre. See EZ Vol. III pp. 189-190.

[4] Ceylon Antiquary Vol. III p.12.

[5] Ibid., p.13.

[6] Grants of landed property to monasteries occur in Indian inscriptions round about the same period. See Lüders' list Nos. 1015, S 18, 1106, 1124, S 19 and 22.

Both the inscriptions and the chronicles abound with references to grants made to the saṅgha in the first seven centuries of the Christian era. During this period grants of land seem to have become progressively extensive. The land donated by Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga (7-19 A.D.) to the Pāsānadīpaka monastery was 'half a yojana in extent'.[1] Mahānāga (569-571) granted three hundred 'fields' to the Jetavana monastery and a thousand 'fields' to the Mahāvihāra.[2] Similarly, the yuvarāja of Aggabodhi I (571-604) donated two hundred 'fields' to the Girivihāra which he built, presumably in Dakkhiṇadesa.[3] There is no means of verifying the reliability of the figures given in the chronicle. Further, the use of vague terms like 'field' leaves no clear indication of the exact extent of the land granted.

There was also some variation in the types of property granted to the saṅgha. Aggabodhi I endowed the Kurunda monastery with a coconut plantation which was 'three yojanas in extent'.[4] Mogallāna III is said to have donated more than three hundred salterns.[5] But villages were the most popular type of property granted to the saṅgha. Even after

---

[1] Mv., 34.92.

[2] Cv., 41.98.

[3] Cv., 42.9.

[4] Cv., 42.15-16.

[5] loṇakhetta, Cv., 44.49.

making allowances for possible exaggerations it would appear that the grants of this period had increased in extent and value.

The acceptance of property introduced a new idea into the organization of the saṅgha. The earliest donations, mostly of caves, were made to the entire saṅgha as implied by the formula, 'to the community of monks of the four directions, present and absent'.[1] But donations of property were made, even from the time of Laṅjatissa, to individual monasteries. As a result of this practice the monastery came to represent not merely a collection of resident monks but also a corporate property-owning institution. The fact that the inmates of monasteries came to believe that the property granted to their monasteries belonged to them alone and not to the whole saṅgha as such is evident from the boundary disputes among the monks of the Mahāvihāra, Dakkhiṇavihāra and the Abhayagiri monastery recorded in the chronicles.[2]

It is noteworthy that some of these grants were made not merely to a monastery but to a particular institution within the monastery, like a parivena or a shrine. Buddhadāsa (337-365) is said to have endowed the Moraparivena at the Mahāvihāra with two villages - Samaṇagāma and Goḷapāṇugāma.[3] Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667) gave the village Mahāgalla

---

[1] agata anagata catudisa sagasa.

[2] Chronicles refer to three instances of such disputes in the reigns of Kaṇiṭṭha Tissa, Mahāsena and Dāṭhopatissa. Mv., 36.10-13; 37.32-33. Cv., 45.-29-30.

[3] Cv., 37.173.

to a meditation hall and Kasagāma to the Moraparivena.[1] These grants may indicate the expansion of the monastery and the consequent rise into importance of sub-units in its organization. Certain grants make a further specification. Koṭṭhagāma granted by Udaya I (797-801) was for the protection of an image house; the village Mahāmaga granted by the same king was for expenses on festivals connected with the Kholakkhiya Buddha image.[2]

No mention of land grants occur, as L. S. Perera has pointed out,[3] in the inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries. However, this would not necessarily mean that grants were not made. For the Cūlavaṃsa records many instances of land being granted to monasteries at and outside the capital. Sena I (833-853) and Kuṭṭhaka, a general of Sena II (853-887), assigned mahābhoga to various dwellings attached to the Mahāvihāra.[4] Sena II granted bhogagāma to the Lohapāsāda.[5] Geiger renders the term mahābhoga into English as 'great revenues' and bhogagāma as 'maintenance villages'. In the reign of Kassapa IV (898-914), his general Sena Ilaṅga issaid to have assigned 'maintenance villages' to the hermitages he built, some of which were for the monks of the Mahāvihāra nikāya.[6] Dappula IV (924-935 A.D.) granted a village to the

---

[1] Cv., 45.27-28.

[2] CV., 49.14-16.

[3] L. S. Perera; Institutions of Ancient Ceylon from Inscriptions (Unpublished thesis), p. 1327.

[4] Cv., 50.70; 51.88.

[5] Cv., 51.71.

[6] Cv., 52.26.

shrine of the Bodhi-tree at Mahāvihāra.[1]

The Abhayagiri monastery, too, figures in an equally important manner in the lists of grants found in the Cūlavaṃsa. The yuvarāja of Sena I endowed the parivena Mahindasena with 'revenues' and gave it to the community at Abhayagiri.[2] Saṅghā, the queen of Sena II, also made a similar donation.[3] Kassapa IV granted a village to the mansion he built at the Abhayagiri monastery.[4] Kassapa V (914-923) presented two villages to the Bhaṇḍika and Silāmegha parivenas at the same monastery.[5]

Other major monasteries which benefited from grants were the Jetavana and the Mariccavaṭṭi. Seni I fixed 'large revenues for the residence he built at the Jetavana monastery.[6] Kassapa V granted 'maintenance villages' to the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery which he renovated.[7] Dappula III (923-924) gave it a village; Mahinda IV (956-972) assigned 'maintenance villages' to the Candanapāsāda he erected within

---

[1] Cv., 53.10.

[2] Cv., 51.60.

[3] Cv., 51.86.

[4] Cv., 52.13.

[5] Cv., 52.58.

[6] Cv., 50.66.

[7] Cv., 52.46.

its premises.[1] It was not only the monasteries at the capital which benefited from grants of land during the period under consideration. The Cūlavaṃsa records grants of villages and 'maintenance villages' made to the Senaggabodhi shrine at Polonnaruva, the monasteries of Kūṭatissa, Maṇḍalagiri and Nīlārāma in Rājaraṭṭha, Buddhagāma monastery in Malaya and the Mahiyaṅgaṇa monastery in Rohaṇa.[2] Inscriptions from a ruined site in Kaludiyapokuṇa reveal that there was a large and well endowed monastery at the site.[3] The preceding account of the donations made to the community of monks reveals that the major monasteries of Anurādhapura such as the Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri, Jetavana and the Mariccavaṭṭi as well as monasteries from various other parts of the Island had, by this time, come to own sources of income in varied types of property like fields, estates, salterns, villages and irrigation works.

A relevant problem which merits discussion at this stage is the extent of this 'ownership' and the control that the 'owners' possessed over the property. This is especially important as these donations of property could have meant the transfer of taxes or income due from them and not of the complete property rights. If such was the case, the

---

[1] Cv., 53.2; 54.40.

[2] Cv., 49.17; 51.74-75.

[3] EZ Vol. III pp. 253-269.

taxes due to the state or a share of the income would be transferred to the monastery which would, however, have no real control over the property.

Two statements in the Mahāvaṃsa shed clarifying light on the nature of at least some of these grants. Gajabāhu I is said to have granted to the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery a piece of land which he had bought for a hundred thousand (kahāpaṇas?); his mother bought another plot of land from the Mahāvihāra to build a dwelling for monks.[1] It is certainly evident from the first reference that it was a proprietary right rather than a right to the royal dues that was being granted. The second reference makes it clear that, even as early as in the second century A.D., monasteries could, at least theoretically, dispose of their lands. In certain inscriptions, grants of property are made after exempting them from kara which most probably denoted a tax (kara kaḍaya or kara kaḍavaya).[2] Hence it is possible to suggest that at least some of these grants made to monasteries involved the transfer of a form of ownership which included and amounted to more than the royal dues.

Inscriptions and chronicles prove to be of little avail in determining the nature of the relationship which prevailed between the monastery and its tenants and in investigating into the ways in which the

---

[1] Mv., 35.121.

[2] See Paranavitana's interpretation of these terms in EZ Vol. III pp. 117-118.

monastery exerted its rights of ownership during this period. However, the Samantapāsādikā, the commentary of Buddhaghosa on the Vinaya Piṭaka, throws somelight on ownership of land and the property rights of the monastery in the formative phase of these practices. In one passage, Buddhaghosa lays down the procedure to be followed in the exchange of property:

> 'This is the procedure to be followed in exchange of property: A coconut plantation belonging to the saṅgha is situated at a distance from the monastery. Kappiyakarakas[1] consume much of the produce. And when whatever is left is brought from thither, it would amount to little once the charges of the carts are paid. Some people from a village close to the plantation possess a plantation close to the monastery. They come and suggest that the plantations be exchanged. In such a case, the suggestion should be accepted, if it is agreeable to the saṅgha, without hesitating on the thought that the plantation belongs to the saṅgha and as such should not be exchanged.'[2]

The reference to exchange of property and the realistic manner in which the problems that the landowners have to face, like misappropriation by employees and cost of transport, are described in the Samantapāsādikā leave little doubt that the monastery had come to possess proprietary rights over some if not most of its lands.

While commenting on the word udake in the second section on Pārājikā, Buddhaghosa grades various offences connected with irrigation and recommends penances for each offence.[3] This suggests, though not necessarily, that monks were involved in irrigational activities. The Rāja-

---

[1] For an explanation of this term, see p.134 ff.

[2] Smp., p.1238.

[3] Smp., pp. 343-346.

sikkhāpadavaṇṇanā sub-section of the Tiṃsakavaṇṇanā goes further to clarify this relationship. It provides some rules for the guidance of the monks in their relations with the tenants:

> 'If people, bent on helping the saṅgha, construct an irrigation tank on the land belonging to the saṅgha, and thenceforth provide "allowed articles"[1] from the proceeds of the crops raised with the water from the tank, it is permissible to accept them. And when it is requested, "Appoint a kappiyakāraka for us", it is in order to appoint one. And if these people, being oppressed by the tax demands of the king, were to give up the land and go away, and if others who occupy their land do not give anything to the monks, it is permissible to stop the supply of water; but this should be done in the ploughing season and not in the crop season. And if the people were to say, "Reverend sirs, even in the past people raised crops with water from this tank", then they should be told, "They helped the saṅgha in such and such manner, and provided the saṅgha with such and such articles". And if they say, "We, too, shall do so", it is permissible to accept what they offer.'[2]

The same procedure is recommended for the collection of dues from canals, fields and forests belonging to the saṅgha.[3]

It is quite clear that these rules have been drafted with consideration for the interests of the tenant. Even the coercive measures to make him pay his dues were to be taken in a manner which would not cause him excessive harm. The regulations also imply that the rights of the saṅgha were limited and regulated by precedent. It is on the strength

---

[1] Kappiyabhaṇḍa, 'utensils allowable to the monks'. See Vinaya Piṭaka ([redacted]) Vol. I p.192.

[2] Smp., p.679.

[3] Smp., p.682.

of the precedent that the previous tenant had been paying dues that the monastery demanded dues from the new tenant. The monastery was not to demand dues from the first tenant. It was left to his discretion.[1] In actual practice, however, this would hardly have been a hindrance or a limitation. A donor of a field, canal or a tank would see to it that the income and the rights that were his due were transferred to the monastery after donation. This would create the necessary precedent for the monastery to establish its rights. The most important relevant fact that emerges from this passage is that the rights of the saṅgha in both land and irrigation works were not restricted to the taxes or a share of the income turned over by a third party. They were in actual possession of at least some of these donations and were in a position to enforce the right to their legitimate share by considerately gentle yet effectual means.

It remains to be examined what exactly was involved in the transfer of villages to the monasteries. The grant of a village could involve the right to taxes or to labour from its inhabitants or to a proprietary right over its land or to some or all of these rights. Apart from the term gāma, terms such as ārāmikagāma, lābhagāma and bhogagāma have been used to describe grants of villages made to the saṅgha up to and during the period under consideration. An ārāmikagāma would be a village which supplied men to serve in various capacities at the monasteries.[2] Geiger

---

[1] Smp., p.680.

[2] See p.134

translated the term lābha as 'revenues' and the passage lābhaggāmam... mahesiyā as 'the village the proceeds of which had belonged to the mahesi'.[1] In his valuable paper on 'Proprietary and tenurial rights in ancient Ceylon' L. S. Perera commented that lābha 'does not appear to be a technical term as such though it carries the general meaning of "profit" or "advantage" or "gain"'. He goes on to say that 'whether villages were called bhogagāma or not, most if not all the grants of this period fall into the same type'.[2] This interpretation would imply that though three different terms lābhaggāma bhogagāma and gāma were used in the chronicles, they in fact denoted the same type of grant. This, however, does not seem to be likely.

Though in early Pali literature the term lābha carries the general meanings given above, it seems to have acquired a special sense in the form it occurs in the tenth century inscriptions. It is quite possible that it denoted a similar sense even in the instances where it occurs in the chronicles. The slab inscription of Kassapa V lists three types of monks who lived at the Abhayagiri monastery: apilisarana vat himiyan, lābha laduvan (receipients of lābha) and avas laduvan.[3] The Kapāra[illegible]ma Sanskrit inscription of Saṅghanandin refers to vāsalābhārtha to which the inmates of a monastery were entitled.[4] Paranavitana translated

---

[1] Cv., 42.61.

[2] JHSS Vol. III No. 1 pp. 16, 18-19.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll. 29-30.

[4] EZ Vol. V Pt. I p. 169 l.13

vāsalābhārtha as 'residence, income and welfare'. He suggests that lābha would have been the stipend that an inmate of a monastery received.[1] The stipend could have covered the right to board as well. But most probably it denoted something more than the right to board. If it were not so the reference to a category of monks called recipients of lābha would be meaningless. The payment of special emoluments to monks of scholarly attainments and those who performed administrative duties at the monastery is mentioned in many of the contemporary sources.[2] It would appear that the two instances of the occurrence of lābha in the Cūḷvaṃsa agree with the interpretation of the term as a stipend. It was the learned monks who were honoured by Moggallāna III with assignments of especially high lābha.[3] Aggabodhi II granted a lābhaggāma belonging to his queen to the men who were to guard the relic-shrine at the Thūpārāma.[4] Lābhaggāma in this context may be interpreted as a village granted as or in lieu of a stipend.

The term bhoga (bhuj or bhuñj) occurs in Sanskrit in a wide variety of meanings including 'enjoyment', 'usufruct', 'food', 'income', 'revenues' and 'wealth'. In Indian inscriptions it appears as a technical term connoting a special type of 'royal dues' as well as in a general sense of 'enjoyment', 'possession' and 'wealth' to quote only a few of

---

[1] EZ Vol. V Pt. I p. 169 n.7.

[2] See pp. 168, 213

[3] Cv., 44.47.

[4] Cv., 42.61.

its connotations.[1] The Pali dictionary gives the following explanation of bhogagāma: ' "village of revenue", a tributary village i.e. a village which has to pay tribute or contribution (in food etc.) to the owner of its ground.'[2]

In the Pali chronicles, too, the term bhoga has been used in a wide variety of meanings. Moggallāna I and III gave bhoga when they gave their sisters and daughters in marriage.[3] Here it could mean either 'wealth' or 'revenues'. Geiger has chosen the latter. Dhātusena restored to his brother Kumārasena his pubbabhoga which consisted of two hundred fields and half the income from Kālavāpi.[4] In this context the term most probably meant proprietary right rather than the royal dues. But the term bhoga has been used in the chronicle to denote some type of royal dues, too. In one particular strophe, the term occurs in the sense of both 'tax' and of 'property'. While describing the meritorious works of Mahinda IV, the chronicler mentinns a decree of this king appealing to future kings not to charge bhoga from saṅghabhoga.[5] These examples reveal, as Perera has pointed out, that bhoga was a general term the meaning of which depended on its context.[6] It may be

---

[1] Monier Williams, Sanskrit Dictionary, 1872, p.722.

[2] Pali-English Dictionary (PTS)

[3] Cv., 39.55; 41.7.

[4] Cv., 38.53.

[5] rājā so'nāgate bhogam rājāno saṅghabhogato
na gaṇhatuti pasaṇe likhapetva nidhapayi. Cv., 54.28.

[6] See JHSS Vol. III No. 1 p.18.

added that even in instances where the king makes grants of bhoga, the word is liable to any one of these interpretations and may not necessarily connote the transfer of 'revenues' or 'revenue-yielding villages'.

The term bhogagāma occurs in the Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa.[1] In the Cūlavaṃsa it occurs for the first time in the reign of Kassapa I (473-491) and is found in numerous instances up to the reign of Parakkamabāhu II (1236-1270).[2] These instances reveal that the practice of granting bhogagāmas was widely prevalent in different parts of the Island throughout the period under consideration. It is also noteworthy that all these instances of grants of bhogagāmas concern the maintenance of people, whether they be monks or laymen. Though villages are granted for such purposes as meeting the cost of daily ritual at shrines and of festivals the term bhogagāma is never used in such a context. The validity of this observation is brought out by descriptions of some of the grants found in the Cūlavaṃsa. Sena II granted bhogagāmas to the Lohapāsāda which he had renovated and decreed that thirty monks should live there.[3] Some grants are more specific. Udaya I renovated the Giribhaṇḍa monastery and granted bhogagāmas to the monks living there.[4]

---

[1] Shsvp., p.158.

[2] Cv., 39.10; 44.51, 97-101; 46.12-14; 49.21; 51.74; 60.79; 61.54-55; 84.3-4.

[3] Cv., 51.71.

[4] bhogagāme ca dāpesi bhikkhūnaṃ taṃ nivāsinaṃ Cv., 49.29.

Kassapa V restored the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery and granted bhogagāmas to the five hundred monks whom he had settled there.[1] Similarly, it was to the monks of the same monastery that Mahinda IV assigned bhogagāmas.[2] It also appears in a statement made in the Cūlavaṃsa in connection with the reign of Kassapa IV that bhogagāmas were distinct from villages granted to the employees of the monastery (ārāmikagāmas). For this king is said to have endowed the monasteries he built with bhogagāmas and ārāmikagāmas.[3] It is probable that bhogagāmas were assigned to provide the monks with their priestly requisites. Such an interpretation would gain strength from a strophe in the Cūlavaṃsa according to which Aggabodhi IV is said to have granted bhogagāmas to monks of the 'two fraternities' on having learnt that they were in need of 'requisites'.[4] It is probably with this idea in view that Geiger rendered the term into English as 'maintenance village'.

In certain instances grants of 'maintenance villages' most probably involved the transfer of rights different from and more than those to royal dues. In one case, Kassapa I is said to have bought the 'maintenance villages' he granted to the Issarasamaṇa monastery.[5] It seems unlikely that by the fifth century taxes from all the villages

---

[1] Cv., 52.46.

[2] Cv., 54.40.

[3] Cv., 52.26.

[4] Cv., 46.15.

[5] Issarasamaṇārāmaṃ kāretvā pubbavatthuto adhikaṃ bhogagāme ca kiṇitvā tassa dāpayi Cv., 39.10.

in this area had been granted away that the king had to buy some back to make a re-grant. Further, if it was only the royal dues which were being transferred, the location of the villages would have been of no great importance and as such the necessity to buy the villages would not have arisen. But this action of the king would be more understandable if the grant involved the transfer of rights to something more than and other than the royal dues from the villages - perhaps the proprietor's share of the crops.

Further evidence is available in an inscription from Rambāva in the Kāndā Korale, dated in the reign of Mahinda IV, which refers to a grant of a piece of land to be enjoyed by the children and the descendants of a person called Kalingurad Pirivat Hāmbuvan.[1] It is a transfer of fields and dry land from the sambhogagamu Vangurupiṭi excluding what had been previously dedicated to the saṅgha. It is clearly a transfer of tenurial rights and not of revenue rights. The grant implies that the king had a proprietary right over the village except in the lands which had already been given to the saṅgha; and the village is termed sambhogagamu. The Pali equivalent of the term, sambhogagāma, does not occur in the chronicles and it is very tempting to connect it with bhogagāma and to cite it as further evidence in support of the interpretation given above.

There is, however, one passage in the Cūlavaṃsa which can be cited

---

[1] EZ Vol. II pp. 65-70.

as precluding the interpretation. In this passage, Sena II makes a donation of bhogagāmas to the three monasteries - Buddhagāma, Mahiyaṅgaṇa and Kūṭatissa. But in the very next strophe he is said to have granted sagāmake to the monastery of Maṇḍalagiri.[1] The prefix sa is sometimes used in the sense of P. saha, 'with', but it is not applicable in this particular context. It can also be the abridged form of P. saka and Skt. sva and instances of its use in this sense can be quoted from the Cūlavaṃsa itself.[2] Hence the term sagāmake is probably the equivalent of P. sakagāmake. Geiger translated it as 'villages belonging to himself'. On the basis of this interpretation, it could be argued that the term sagāmake was used to describe the grant to the Maṇḍalagiri monastery to distinguish it from the grants of the former group which did not fall into this category. This would imply that the grant of bhogagāma, at least in this case, was more probably a transfer of revenue and that the interpretation given above is inappropriate.

Bhuttagāma, a term similar in form and derivation to bhogagāma, occurs in the Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa. In one instance a village is granted by the king as bhuttagāma to a lady.[3] But in another instance a king grants the whole division of Rohaṇa as bhuttagāma.[4] Obviously, this

---

[1] Cv., 51. 74-5.

[2] Seen for example Cv. 39.58.

[3] Shsvp., p.64.

[4] Ibid., p.69.

was not a grant of proprietary rights. The use of this term in such a context, too, could cast doubts on the interpretationof bhogagāma given above.

In considering these objections it may be pointed out that the term sagāmake need not necessarily have been used to contrast it with bhogagāma. For it could have been used, as is common in poetry, in a synonymous sense. As regards the second objection, it is not clear whether bhuttagāma was identical in meaning with bhogagāma. In fact, it appears probable that they were different in meaning as both these terms are found in the Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa. Yet as it is safer to draw a conclusion with deference to these objections, the interpretation given above may be modified. It can be stated that at least some of the grants of villages, especially of bhogagāma, involved a claim other than and at times including the right to royal dues. It is possible that this amounted to the proprietary rights over the land of the villages. A clear instance of a monastery exercising such rights is found in the Mihintale Tablets, where the Cetiyagiri monastery is said to have made separate grants of land-allotments and of revenue from two villages, Guṭā and Karandā, to the officials and workmen in its employ.[1]

A type of grant which merely involved the transfer to the monastery of the royal dues or of a share of the produce finds mention in the inscriptions of the ninth and the tenth centuries. The Gonnāva Devāle inscription which belongs to the reign of Sena II or of Dappula IV (V),[2]

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 94-96 ll. A37-38, B33-36, 38-40.

[2] See EZ Vol. IV p.187.

records the grant of a piece of land in Mahamiṇilāṉbim to Agbo Mugayin Varadāna to be held on pamuṇu tenure.[1] The grant carried the proviso that a share (bā) of one amuṇa[2] of paddy for each kiri of field was to be paid at each harvest to the 'inner monastery' of the Mahāvihāra.[3] In an inscription from Nāgama, dated the seventh year of a king identified as Kassapa IV, a certain mahayā Kitambāva was granted the village Koḷayuṇu in the district of Taṇabim to be held on pamuṇu tenure on condition that he paid an annual tax (badu)[4] to the Abhayagiri monastery.[5] Owing to the fragmentary nature of the record, it is not possible to determine the extent of this payment. The Rambāva inscription of the first regnal year of Mahinda IV (956-972) presents a list of property granted to a person called Kalingurad Pirivat Hämbuvan. The donee was to supply oil for two months each year, at the rate of one lāha a week, for the maintenance of lamps at the shrine of the Bo-tree at the Mahāvihāra.[6] All these three grants carried the immunities usually associated with direct grants of land to monasteries.

---

[1] For pamuṇu tenure, see rp.89ff.

[2] An amuṇa was a measure of grain amounting to four pāḷas and forty lāhas. The lāha was the equivalent of the kuruṇi and this was equal to four näḷi (nāḷi). According to the DAG, the maṇa was half a nāḷi. But the meaning of pāḷa is vague. Evidence in the JAG suggests it was a nāḷi. A commentary on the Kharīkavitaṃṭi quoted by Sorata equates it with the eighth of a nāḷi. In the Mihintale Tablets certain employees are given an admaṇa and 2 pat of rice. This implies that a paṭa was less then an eighth of a nāḷi.

[3] EZ Vol. Iv pp. 186-191.

[4] Badu is used in the sense of government dues in the Badulla inscription. EZ Vol. V Pt. II p.186 l. C8

[5] EZ Vol. II pp. 14-19.

[6] EZ Vol. II pp. 65-70.

The grants recorded in these inscriptions obviously belong to a new type. The donee evidently enjoyed a permanent tenurial right over the land. For the first two cases were transfers of pamunu tenure while in the third it is specified that the land was to be enjoyed in hereditary succession by the descendants of the donee. The donee also enjoyed exemption from the usual royal dues. The monastery was not the owner of the land. But it enjoyed certain specified rights, which in a sense restricted the rights of ownership enjoyed by the donee. A part of the income had to be turned over to the monastery. In the first inscription this is termed 'share'; it does not seem to have amounted to a substantial part of the yield.[1]

The third inscription carries another condition: 'Should there arise a dispute concerning this (grant), the apilisarana monks of the Mahāvihāra shall settle it.'[2] This seems to suggest that the monastery wielded a certain amount of influence and authority over the administration of these grants. But the extent of this influence and authority would have varied according to the circumstances. The lands mentioned in the Gonnāva inscription were situated in the Kurunāgala district, and such a remote situation would naturally ensure for the donee the freedom from excessive intervention by monastic authority. The donee in the Nägama inscription bore the title mahayā while his counterpart in the Rambāva

---

[1] The Saddharmālaṅkāra (Bentoṭa Saddhātissa, 1934 p.10) states that a good field was expected to yield a yāla for each amuna sown. On this rate a kiri of field would produce eighty amunas of paddy. Even if the produce of the field is placed at forty amunas, the share of the monastery was not substantial.

[2] meyaṭ van viyavulak ätа mahaveherä apilisarana saṅgun sāhā denu koṭ EZ Vol. II p.68 ll. 29-30. For apilisarana saṅgun, see p.

slab inscription was termed Kaliṅgurad (Kāliṅgarāja). Presumably both were important officials. The authority of the monastery would be restricted by the power and the position of such donees. But these grants, reminiscent of similar endowments made to monasteries in Java, ensured for the monastery a source of income without the attendant responsibilities of landownership.

Another problem which concerns the ownership of land is whether the grants made to monasteries were permanent. A passage in the Samantapāsādikā seems to suggest that a grant made by a royal personage was valid only till the end of his lineage:

> 'When the continuity of the lineage (of the donor) is severed, if whosoever becomes the lord of the province (janapada) does not hinder the enjoyment (of the grant) but re-grants it, like the queen of Alandanāgarāja in the case of the tank enjoyed by the monks of the Cittalapabbata monastery, it is in order.'[1]

This passage points to the prevalence of the practice of making re-grants and suggests by implication the possibility of the withdrawal of a grant by a new ruler.

A passage in the Cūlavaṃsa suggests the same possibility when the chronicler, while describing the reign of Udaya I (797-801), states that this particular king honoured the decrees and edicts of previous kings and maintained and safeguarded the donations made by his father.[2] The possibility of withdrawal of grants gains further strength from a passage in the Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V in which the king

---

[1] Smp., pp. 679-680.

[2] Cv., 49.21-22.

decrees that his successors should not 'confiscate in anger the land granted on pamuṇu tenure with full reliance in the efficacy of the Buddhist religion'.[1]

Actual cases of withdrawalof grants are hard to come by. The Colombo Museum pillar inscription of Kassapa IV can be cited as a record of one such instance if its present interpretation is accepted. The inscription records an endowment made to a timbirige (maternity home). Immunities were granted to this property after 'having excluded perä kusalān'.[2] Paranavitana translated this term as 'previous religious gifts'.[3] Bell interpreted the term kusalān as 'a benefaction given and received by the pouring of water'.[4] More recently W. S. Karuṇāratna has attempted to trace the origin of the term of kuśala-śrāvana and to interpret it as 'the proclamation of a meritorious benefaction'. He has further pointed out that in modern parlance the term koholan kaḷa, probably derived from kusalān kaḷa, is used to describe property donated to the saṅgha.[5] If, on this basis, Paranavitana's interpretation is accepted, the possibility of withdrawals of religious donations seems rather strong.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p. 47 l.26.

[2] EZ Vol. III p. 275 ll. D12-14.

[3] EZ Vol. III p.277.

[4] CALR Vol. X Pt. I p.7.

[5] See EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 143-44.

In actual practice, however, the withdrawal of grants made to monasteries would have been by no means a desirable or easy task. The founder of a new dynasty, with his eye on the means to consolidate his power, would hardly have deemed it wise to estrange the sympathies of the saṅgha, by withdrawing the land held by them. The reaction which greeted the attempts of Mahāsena and Daṭhopatissa II to re-allocate the property claimed by one monastery to another shows how difficult the task would have been.[1] Apart from instances of plunder of the wealth accumulated in monasteries by kings at war, no attempt to confiscate the land granted to monasteries is evident till the end of the Anurādhapura period.

It is not certain whether all the donors who granted land to monasteries had complete property rights over them. Doubts would be particularly strong as regards grants made by officials and lesser individuals. A fourteenth-century inscription, for example, refers to a grant made to a monastery of divel land belonging to an official;[2] such a grant could not have been permanent. But we cannot be certain whether the meaning of the term divel had changed by the fourteenth century.

It is, however, most probable that most of the grants to the saṅgha were intended to be permanent. Two inscriptions from Ayitigevāva and Ätvīragollāva, dated in the reign of Kassapa V, record immunities

---

[1] Mv., 37.32-33; Cv., 45.29-30.

[2] EZ Vol. IV pp. 90-110. For divel see p.188.

granted to lands belonging to monasteries. At the end of each inscription are two disc emblems identified by Wickremasinghe as representations of the sun and the moon.[1] These probably embodied the idea expressed in detail in later inscriptions - that the grant was to be valid as long as the sun and the moon lasted. This would indicate that at least some of the inscriptions dealt with permanent grants of land made to the saṅgha.

Even if the donations made to monasteries were permanent it is possible that their lands were alienated by sale and mortgage. The strict rules laid down by the kings of this period prohibiting sale and mortgage of monastic property point to the prevalence of these practices. According to the Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV, nothing whatsoever belonging to the 'inner monastery'[2] or the 'relic shrine' was to be given on loan. It was not to be purchased if offered for sale by monastic officials. The same edict lays down later on that no land or villages belonging to the monastery should in any way be given away on pamuṇu or ukas tenure. The gold given in payment by those who acquired the land was to be confiscated and given over to the monastery. Those who were responsible for the transaction were to be banished from the country.[3] L. S. Perera has observed, after examining the various instances where this term occurs that a grant

---

[1] EZ Vol. II pp. 34-38, 44-49.

[2] ät vehera. See p.156

[3] ät veher dāge pilibad kavari vatakud pirul nodiya yutu. kämiyan vikinij nogatä yutu ... meveherhi bad tuvak gambim kavaru pariyayen ukas pamaṇu nodiyä yutu isa gatuvan ranä nohimikoṭ veheraṭme navata gatä yutu isa dunuvan des yavanu koṭ ... EZ Vol. I p. 92 ll. A29-30, p. 97 ll. B56-58.

of land as pamuṇu 'confers to the grantee the most complete ownership possible within the tenure system'.[1] The passage quoted from the Mihintale Tablets reveals that this transaction involved money. Hence in this context, it would have amounted to a sale of land. The second term, as both Codrington and Perera have shown,[2] connotes 'mortgage'. Prohibition of sale and mortgage of land belonging to the saṅgha on pain of such severe punishments should have helped to conserve monastic wealth. But it is not certain whether these regulations were in force throughout the period under consideration and also whether they were as severe in the manner they were enforced as they are in their wording.

The possibility of withdrawing grants made to monasteries and of disposal of property by monasteries themselves through sale and mortgage make it difficult to determine the extent of property under the control of the larger monasteries at Anurādhapura. Further, the chroniclers lack exactitude and precision in their descriptions of donations; nor can they be expected to have recorded all the grants that were made. Apart from the 'villages', 'thousand villages' and the 'three hundred salterns' donated to the three nikāyas, the chronicles make specific references to the grants of Samaṇagāma, Kasagāma, Paṇṇeli, Goḷapānugāma, Tintinigāma and three other villages, a piece of land worth a hundred thousand

---

[1] L. S. Perera: Institutions .... p.1261.

[2] Ibid., pp. 1262-1264. H. W. Codrington, Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon, 1938, pp. 13-14.

(kahāpaṇas?) and a thousand fields to the Mahāvihāra;[1] the villages Aṅganasālaka and Dūratissa, more than four other villages including a weavers' village, the tank Kolavāpi and the Rahera canal to the Abhayagiri monastery;[2] three hundred fields and the villages Goṇḍigāma and Vasabhagāma to the Jetavana monastery[3] and ten amuṇas sowing extent of fields to the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale.[4]

Inscriptions provide more reliable evidence on the subject, though on the whole the information available in them is meagre. According to the Mannar Kacceri inscription the Bahadurusen pirivena of the Mahāvihāra owned the villages Pepodatuḍa, Kumbalhala and Tumpokuṇ in the Kuḍakadavukā division of the Northern Coast.[5] The Sen Senevirad pirivena of the monastery same owned Posonavulla (probably the name of a piece of land) in Sulinnarugama, twelve kiri from Mahamaṇḍala and four payas from Gälinduru Gomaṇḍala.[6] Another pirivena of the Mahāvihāra held five payalas of land close to Polonnaruva while the village Mahagāpiyova in the district of Pirivatubima in the Southern Quarter belonged to the Kasub Senevirat Pirivena.[7]

---

[1] Cv., 37.172-173; 41.96-97; 42.17; 45.28; 53.10.

[2] Cv., 41.31, 96-97; 42.63; 44.68-69; 46.19-22; 48.2; 52.13, 58.

[3] Cv., 41.96-98.

[4] Cv., 38.77.

[5] EZ Vol. III pp. 100-113.

[6] EZ Vol. I pp. 163-171, 172-175. Pā, pāḍa and paya seem to be synonymous and denote a fourth of a kiri. It is not certain whether payala meant the same. Payala can be equated also with pāla which amounted to a fourth of an amuṇa and hence a sixteenth of a kiri.

[7] EZ Vol. II pp. 28-43; Vol. IV pp. 59-67.

The Jetvanārāma Sanskrit inscription suggests that the villages Lahasikā, Uruḷugoṇu, Ambilagrāma, Hunāla, Ulavappasikhaṇṭigrāma, Kīrā, Pallāya and Sunagrāma belonged to monasteries attached to the Abhayagiri nikāya.[1] The Moragoḍa and Nägama inscriptions, both dated to the reign of Kassapa IV, reveal that the Abhayagiri monastery had interests in land near Padaviya.[2] Two payas of land from Väligamu were assigned to the employees at the Kapārārāma.[3] Evidence on the property of the Jetavana monastery is restricted to a single record. This inscription, found at Atvīragollāva in Kaḍavat Korale, reveals that the village Velangama belonged to the Sirisangborad Pirivena of the Jetavana monastery.[4]

Information of a more specific nature is available on the extent of the temporalities of the Cetiyagiri monastery. However, this, too, is by no means complete. The Plinth Course inscription copied by Müller seems to refer to payments due to the monastery from the officials of the 'four districts' (satar raṭä).[5] It is not clear whether the monastery possessed any property rights over these areas. The fragmentary nature of the record precludes us from obtaining any more details. According to the Mihintale Tablets[6] the villages Karandägama and Gutägama, land at Kiribaṇḍpavu and

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.4 ll.4, 8-9.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 200-207; Vol. II pp. 14-19.

[3] EZ Vol. I p. 49 ll. 50-51.

[4] EZ Vol. I pp. 44-49.

[5] Possibly this was an annual payment. It is clear that it brought in more than 68 kaḷand of gold. AIC No. 114. For kaḷand, see p.95.

[6] EZ Vol. I pp. 75-113.

around Pohonāvil and the Porodeṇi tank and the vāsara,[1] land at Manu and on the upper and lower parts of Lihinipavu belonged to the monastery. The monastery also held rights to labour from the villages Vaḍudevāgama, Sunuboldevāgama and Dunumugama. The physician at the monastery was assigned detisäseṇen niya päḷiyāk and the master craftsman boṅḍvehera seṇāya. Paranavitana equates seṇā with modern Sinhalese hēṇa and niya with Skt. nija and later Sinhalese ninda. Ninda connoted the 'entire property of the owner'. Paranavitana compares päḷiya with P. pāli (var. pāḷi) which occurs in the Papañcasūdanī in the sense of 'allotment'. He is probably right when he interprets the first phrase on this basis as denoting an allotment of arable land (as distinct from fields) called Detisä.[2] This interpretation would imply that the Cetiyagiri monastery possessed such 'dry' arable land at Boṅḍvehera and at Detisä.[3] It is rather unfortunate that the inscription does not state the actual extent of the land. In certain instances it is more specific. Land allotments amounting to eighteen kiri from Taḷolagama, two kiri from Sapugamiya, three kiri from Mangulāva, two kiri from Ālgamiya and a payala from Damgamiya occur among assignments set apart as payment to employees and for expenses regarding repairs.

The evidence cited above stands in striking contrast to the solitary

---

[1] Paranavitana has translated the term as 'irrigated land below a tank'. See EZ Vol. Iv pp. 124-126.

[2] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 130-132.

[3] Detisä could also mean 'thirty-two'.

grant of ten amuṇas recorded in the Cūlavaṃsa and helps to provide us with some idea of the extent of land in the possession of the Cetiyagiri monastery. Yet one cannot expect to obtain a comprehensive list of property from records of administrative regulations that these inscriptions primarily are. But a fair idea of the resources of the monastery may be formed by considering the various commitments of the institution. The Cetiyagiri monastery maintained more than a hundred and seventy employees. About a hundred and seven kiri and three pā of land were set apart as remuneration for their services. If we base our calculations on the conservative estimates of Codrington, this would amount to 431 acres.[1] This was in addition to the allotments made to the physician and the master craftsman and the five villages - Karandāgama, Gutāgama, Dunumugama, Sunuboldevāgama and Vaḍudevāgama - assigned to various other employees. In a year of three hundred and sixty five days, seventeen amuṇas, two pālas, five kuruṇis, one nāli and one pat of rice were given to employees alone as daily allowances; forty five kalandas and one aka of gold were spent on special allowances. In addition to this, twenty nine vasags[2] were kept apart for officials and workmen employed in various capacities. These constituted merely the payments made to employees.

One hundred kalandas of gold, ten yālas (= two hundred amuṇas) of paddy and all the offerings received at the main shrines of the monastery together with the allotments from Ālgamiya and Damgamiya mentioned above

---

[1] See p. 66 n.3

[2] For an explanation of vasag, see pp. 213-215.

were set apart to meet the cost of repairs and maintenance of monastic buildings. Thus it is evident that in gold alone the annual expenditure of the monastery on these heads amounted to a hundred and forty five kalanda and one aka. According to the calculations of Codrington a kalanda would weigh about 70 to 72 English grains.[1] If this is accepted, the expenditure incurred by the monastery would amount to about 10,158.75 to 10,449 English grains of gold. In addition to these expenses, the monastery had to provide board for its resident staff and the considerably large population of monks,[2] bear the cost of robes and pay special allowances to learned monks.[3]

This abstract of the finances of the Cetiyagiri monastery points to the ownership of extensive resources presumably based mainly on landed property. It is unfortunate that no such detailed information is available on the resources and commitments of the three major monasteries of Anurādhapura. But the fact that the Cetiyagiri monastery was an adjunct of the Abhayagiri nikāya reflects the extensive nature of the resources of this nikāya.

Like some Hindu temples of India,[4] the monastery enjoyed privileges in irrigation facilities. When a dispute between the royal officials and the employees of the Isuramenu monastery concerning the rights to water from the Tisō tank was brought to the notice of a king, identified as

---

[1] Codrington, Ceylon Coins and Currency, 1924, p.9.

[2] See pp. 207-8.

[3] See p. 213.

[4] See for example SII Vol. IV Pt. I No. 18.

Mahinda IV, he gave his decision in favour of the monastery and set up an edict for the future guidance of his men. The fields belonging to the monastery were to be given precedence in the distribution of water from the tank. Water from this tankwas to be diverted to the fields without interruption until the stone pillar set up in front of the sluice-gate, at a depth of four cubits, appeared above the water level. If the crops should be destroyed through the failure of royal officials to supply water, the damage was to be assessed and made good by the king.[1]

In certain cases, donors of land sought to ensure the supply of water for their irrigation. A tenth-century pillar inscription at present at the Colombo Museum records the grant of a piece of land to an image-house and also provides for the maintenance of the traditional water supply to the land from a nearby stream.[2] In some instances the monastery had rights over irrigation works in the vicinity. The Cetiyagiri monastery was entitled to the diyabedum (share or income from water) from the Kaṇā tank;[3] hence water for its fields in this area was readily available.

---

[1] Vessagiri Inscriptions, Slab A, EZ Vol. I pp. 29-38. Commenting on this description, Wickremasinghe confessed that he could not make out the meaning of the term a(ya)sama(nara)dolen in the phrase näsuvanaṭ a(ya)sama-(nara) dolen taba denu koṭ. ll. 29-30. This is, evidently, one of Wickremasinghe's initial and less careful attempts. He deciphered the passage correctly but faltered in the separation of words. If this is done correctly, the phrase would read, näsuva naṭ a(ya) sama(nā)(ra)dolen tabā denu koṭ, 'the income lost should be made good (samana probably from samay 'to settle') by the state (lit. royal palace).'

[2] EZ Vol. IV pp. 244-252.

[3] EZ Vol. I p. 97 ll. B55.

In other instances, land belonging to monasteries were exempted from the water dues. The Iripinniyāva and Rambāva inscriptions, dating from the reign of Udaya II or of Kassapa IV, and the Buddannehāla inscription of a king identified as Kassapa V record the exemption of lands belonging to the respective monasteries from the payment of diyabedum.[1]

Apart from plantations of coconut and areca[2] crops like sesame, green gram (muŋg) and uŋdu were cultivated on monastic land.[3] Rice was perhaps the major crop. A tenth century record stipulates that the land of the monasteries should be devoted to the cultivation of paddy and not other crops.[4] Part of the land belonging to the monastery was given to the employees in remuneration for their services. Whatever was left would have been portioned out to peasant cultivators on a 'share-cropping' basis or cultivated directly by the monastery.

The Mihintale Tablets stipulate that the land and the villages belonging to the monastery should be 'settled' in the kärä tenure; they were not to be given away on pāṭṭa.[5] Wickremasinghe compared kärä with Skt. kārikā and held it to be a payment on a fixed rate like the 'tithe'.[6]

---

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 163-171, 172-173, 191-200. For a discussion on diyabedum, see L. S. Perera in JHSS Vol. II No. 1 p.23.

[2] See p.119.

[3] EZ Vol. I p. 33 l.27; Vol. III p. 177 l.6. uŋdu is a variety of flemingia. muŋg is a type of Legumimosae.

[4] EZ Vol. I p. 33 l.27.

[5] me veherä bad tuvāk gamhi käräyehi bändä salasat mut pāṭṭa nodiyä yutu. EZ Vol. I p. 92 ll. A43-44. For pāṭṭa, see p.175.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.103 n.12.

Codrington equated it with Tamil karaiyidu, a term which probably connoted 'temporary allotments'.[1] Paranavitana believed that it was synonymous with Skt. kārya and suggested that it referred to a service-tenure system.[2] Perera preferred the last interpretation commenting that it would have been a system similar to divel,[3] but with the difference that in addition to service the tenant would have had to pay a tithe, too.[4]

More recently, in a fresh interpretation of the term, Paranavitana has compared the term with kara, derived from kṝ, which has been used in both Sanskrit and Sinhalese in the sense of 'dues', 'tax' or 'revenue'. 'In the meaning of "liable to revenue",' he maintains, ' we should have the gerundive from this root, kīrya, from which the mediaeval Sinhalese form kärä, kära, kärā can regularly develop on the analogy of Sinh. värа from Skt. vīrya.' Thus taking the term as connoting a tax, he has translated kärä - vädāruman and kärä-pākāruman in the Koṇḍavaṭṭavan inscription as 'inspectors of taxable land' and 'assessors of taxable land'.[5]

The variety of derivations suggested for the term is in itself a clear indication of the difficulty of arriving at a definition through etymological considerations. It may be noted that Paranavitana tries to trace the derivation of the term to kīrya, a word which is not attested. Therefore, it would seem more advisable to interpret this word on the

---

[1] Codrington, Ancient Land Tenure..... pp. 14-16.

[2] EZ Vol. III p. 191 n.3

[3] L. S. Perera, Institutions.... p.1274.

[4] For divel, see p. [illegible] ; also EZ Vol. III p. 191 n.9.

[5] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 128-129.

basis of the contexts in which it occurs.

Karä has been equated with kara. But in no example can kärä be definitely identified as denoting a tax. If kärä was the gerundive of kara, it would be difficult to explain why kärä was preferred in some inscriptions, while kara in the form of karavuvara was used in the sense of tax in other contemporary inscriptions and literary works.[1] Moreover, if kärä denoted a tax, one would expect it to occur in immunity grants which list the various royal dues from which the respective properties had been exempted. But kärä is never found in any of the immunity grants.

On the other hand, when taken in its contexts, the term points to an altogether different meaning. According to the Mihintale Tablets, the land was to be 'settled' in kärä tenure; but officials were not to take land belonging to the 'inner monastery' on kärä.[2] The same inscription lays down that kärä fields held by haskaru were not to be taken by the monastery except on failure of their hereditary line.[3] The word has occurs in the sense of 'crop' or 'yield' in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya,[4] a contemporary literary work, and Sorata has interpreted the term haskaru, probably on the strength of this reference, as 'cultivator'.[5] Hence it

---

[1] The DAG equates karavuvara with Pali bali p.62. The Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya p.91 explains the Pali term balikarakapuriso as a 'villager' or a kuḍi who pays karavuvara. The Amāvatura contains a passage in which a king is reminded that it is unjust to charge karavuvara from the people without discharging the reciprocal obligation of maintaining law and order. (Ñāṇāloka ed.) p.103. For inscriptional evidence, see p.283

[2] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A45-46.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll. A.48-49.

[4] DAG p.33.

[5] SSS p.1113.

would appear that kärä was primarily a term used to denote a tenure on which the land was given to peasants for cultiva tion. These peasants seem to have held a hereditary right to cultivate their respective plots. In a secondary sense, the term would have come to mean the share due to the landowner from the tenant cultivators. In another passage of the Mihintale Tablets, it is stated that kärä from villages were to be taken to the monastery.[1] Further, in the Badulla inscription, collectors of dues are instructed to turn over to the monasteries the kärä from religious benefactions.[2] It is evident from the preceding discussion that the land of the monastery was given to peasant cultivators on what was perhaps a 'share-cropping' basis. It is possible that the tenants, in addition to the share they paid, had to serve at the monastery, as Paranavitana and Perera surmised.

B. Stein who has made a study of the inscriptions at the Venkateśvara shrine of the Tirupati temple in South India,[3] has shown that the lands of this shrine were given out to peasants for cultivation and that the share of the temple from the produce of the land varied between fifty-one and seventy-five per cent. No such detailed information is available on the monasteries of Ceylon. The Mihintale Tablets specify that one third of the produce of the land was to be taken to the monastery.[4] It reminds

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p. 93 ll. A.37-38.

[2] EZ Vol. V Pt. II p. 192.

[3] B. Stein, "The economic function of the mediaeval South Indian temple," Jnl. of Asn. Stud., Vol. X 19, 1959-60, pp. 163-177.

[4] EZ Vol. I p. 93 l. A38.

one of the statement of I-tsing that a monastery which he visited in Eastern India gave out its land for cultivation in return for one third of the produce.[1] But it is not certain whether the Mihintale Tablets are referring specifically to the dues the monastery received from its tenants.

In cases where the proprietary rights over villages and large extents of land, particularly fields, were granted to monasteries, little change as to the tenure could have been made, as the land would already have been held by peasant cultivators with a hereditary right to till the land. But the cultivation and maintenance of smaller grants of fields and of plantations of coconut or areca could have been undertaken directly by the monastery. The corvée labour to which the monastery was entitled[2] could be profitably utilized in such enterprises.

An inscription from Buddannehäla, which records a grant of land, carries the provision me raṭhi yedunavun me kumburaṭ pet sama koṭ diya pānā koṭ. This has been translated by Paranavitana as 'employees in this district shall level the beds (of fields) and lead the water to these (aforesaid) fields'.[3] If this rendering is accepted, it would mean that at times the labour due to the state was used to help the monasteries to cultivate their land. Monastic records refer to payments made for hired labour.[4] The use of hired labour to work on fields was not unknown in

---

[1] I-tsing p.62.

[2] See p.188.

[3] EZ Vol. I p. 197 ll. B31-C2, p.199

[4] See p.190.

ancient Ceylon. The Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa contains a story about a man who went in search of work and was hired to harvest a field owned by the governor of a district (raṭṭhika).[1] It is possible that the monastery used labour from all these sources to cultivate a part of its land.

The growth of monastic property wouldhave, from the earliest times, given rise to a need for buffaloes for work in fields and draught-oxen for carts and caravans. The Abhayagiri inscription of Kassapa V carries the warning that the officials who either gave out or took for themselves the oxen of the karvaḷhala of the monastery would be dismissed from service.[2] The Samantapāsādikā prescribes the proper procedure accepting grants of oxen. But it is only in the period of Coḷa rule that a grant of cattle is found for the first time in Ceylon. In an inscription from the Velgam monastery, Ādittaparaiyan, a Tamil, granted eighty-four cows for the maintenance of perpetual lamps at this monastic shrine.[3] The Galpāta monastery, too, lists cattle and buffaloes among various types of property granted to the monastery and refers to cowherds (eṅdera) among its employees.[4]

The inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries contain many grants of exemption from royal dues made to land held by monasteries. Most probably these grants of immunity merely amounted to the transfer of revenue

[1] Shsvp. p.54.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 48-49 ll. 45-46. The term hala could mean a 'hall', 'shed', or a 'traders' stall'. Wickremasinghe has left karvaḷ untranslated. Among meanings of kara, connotations like 'sea' and 'salt' are well known. Vaḷa is often used in ancient Sinhalese literature and modern parlance in the sense of 'pit', 'cistern' or 'low ground'. Hence karvaḷ would mean a 'salt pit' or 'pit in the sea' - a saltern. This is reminiscent of the three hundred salterns granted to the three nikāyas. It is very tempting to suppose on this basis that the karvaḷhala was a place connected with the salterns, where salt was stored or kept for sale, and that the passage referred to oxen used for transportation.

(cont.)

to the monasteries. In this connection a statement which occurs among the regulations for the guidance of monks and monasteries in the administration of the monastery is of particular interest: 'Taxes in excess of, or less than, (what is due according to) former practices are not to be levied.'[1] It clearly reveals that the monasteries were not only entitled to the royal dues but also that their officials actively participated in their collection. Apart from these taxes, some of the monasteries derived an income from the administration of justice in the villages which came under their control.[2]

According to a tenth-century record from Badulla, a trader who kept his shop open on a poya day was liable to a payment of a padda of oil for the maintenance of lamps at the Mahiyaṅgaṇa monastery. If he failed to do so, a fine 'as is customary' was to be charged and used for the same purpose.[3] This could imply that it was usual to close all shops on poya days and that those who did not do so had to make a special payment to the monastery. On the other hand, it is also possible that it amounted to a mere quit-rent paid by those traders who opened stalls on monastic grounds on poya days. But it is not possible to determine the exact nature of this source of income.

(cont.)

[3] CJSG Vol. II No. 596.

[4] EZ Vol. IV p. 207 ll. 19, 23.

[1] pere siritin vaḍā kiṇa karavuvara nobandnā isā. EZ Vol. III p. 265 ll. 39.

[2] See p.179

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. II p. 183 ll. B26-36.

Monasteries as well as individual monks in Central Asia and China took part in commercial enterprises and usury. Perhaps the Theravādin monks of Ceylon cared less for these 'profane activities'. For evidence on this subject is very rare. Yet a Sanskrit record from the Abhayagiri monastery prohibits monks who indulged in agriculture and commerce from living there.[1] Similarly, the Mihintale Tablets stipulate that those monks who took part in buying and selling forfeited their right to live at the monastery.[2] This suggests the possibility of individual monks taking part in commercial activities; but specific instances of such participation are not found on record.

An inscription from Anurādhapura, datable to the reign of Dappula IV (924-935), records a deposit of two hundred kaḷand of gold at a monastery with specific instruction as to how the income from this endowment was to be utilized. It is clear from this record that the donor expected a return of fifteen per cent per annum.[3] The monastery, therefore, would have had to invest the money on its own initiative, in a manner which would enable the fulfilment of the conditions laid down by the donor. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, Mahinda IV built a tambūla-maṇḍapa and assigned the income from it for the purchase of medicinal requirements of the monks

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.16-17.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll. A42-43.

[3] Slab Inscription No. 1. EZ Vol. I pp. 23-29. Twenty kaḷand of gold were set apart for the provision of jaggery worth one aka and clarified butter worth one aka to one monk on the uposatha day in the middle of each month (ll.20-22). From this it is clear that the donor expected a return of 24 akas = 3 kaḷand on an outlay of twenty kaḷand. (8 akas = 1 kaḷand Codrington, Ceylon Coins... p. 11). This would amount to a return of fifteen per cent.

of the Theravamsa.[1] The Badulla inscription refers to special stalls termed madapa (P. mandapa) for the sale of arecanuts and betal. Officials were to prevent the sale of these commodities outside these appointed places.[2] Hence it seems that it was a stall where betel (tambūla) was sold which was donated by Mahinda IV. These two instances suggest the possibility that the monasteries of this period were involved in commercial activities.

It would appear that the monastery, assisted by its rules and regulations prohibiting the sale and mortgage of its property, became the locus for the concentration of wealth, particularly land, in the mediaeval Sinhalese economy. It brought about a notable change in the attitude of the saṅgha towards wealth. According to the Samantapāsādikā, the accept- of property was prohibited to the saṅgha; but this was permissible if the property in question was donated for the specific purpose of meeting the cost of 'allowable articles'[3] or of maintaining monastic buildings in repair.[4] Ostensibly, this was a convenient means of overcoming difficult rules to accommodate current practices. Buddhaghosa was dealing with a problem which was of practical importance to the saṅgha. A strict interpretation of the rules would have been invalid against a practice which which had been current for about five centuries. But, in fact, it also

[1] Cv., 54.46.

[2] EZ Vol. V Pt. II p. 187 ll. C27-32.

[3] See p.74 n.1.

[4] Smp., pp. 678-679.

marks the development of a more positive attitude towards wealth based on the idea that it was permissible for the saṅgha to possess wealth if it served a purpose in accordance with the disciplinary rules.

Again the practice transcended the rule. Donations of cash and precious substances were not an unusual source of income to the monasteries. Mahinda IV, Vijayabāhu I and Nissaṅka Malla weighed themselves in precious substances and presented the saṅgha with this wealth.[1] It is also possible that in addition to the income from grants made without any specification of purpose, some monasteries realized a surplus from other grants after attending to the functions specified by the donors. Presumably, such income was at least partly invested in land or commercial enterprises. The inscription of Kassapa V at the Abhayagiri monastery decrees that the funds of the monastery left after payment of allowances to monks and servants and the expenditure on repairs and decoration should be used to 'acquire villages'.[2] There is an instance of a monastery investing money in land in an inscription from Hiṅguregala dating from about the fourth or the fifth century. According to this record a monastery spent three hundred and eighty kahāpaṇas to buy land at twenty kahāpaṇas a paya.[3] The Galpātavihāra inscription, dated by Paranavitana to the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, mentions that a piece of land was bought with the gold of the monastery and planted

[1] Cv., 54.27; EI Vol. XVIII p. 336 ll. 11-12; EZ Vol. II p.172 ll.11-14.

[2] piriven laddan tamanaṭ pirikāpū vatin mut itirituvāk dāyin saṅgun dāsan vaṭakam navam puja situvam koṭ vādiyak āta gam ganna isa. EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.52-54.

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 111-119.

with areca.[1] When a monastery has a surplus in funds at the end of the year, it implies that it had sufficient resources for its maintenance. The use of these funds for further accumulation of property was, in a sense, a transgression of the limits set by Buddhaghosa and represents a change from his views.

In this connection, a verse which occurs in the Cūlavaṃsa with reference to the queen of Udaya I, seems relevant:

> Gāmā ye'sum purā kītā vihāre tattha sā dhanaṃ
> datva te mocayitvana viharass'eva dapayi.[2]

The passage in which this verse occurs, particularly the two verses which precede it, appear suspect. But thisparticular verse yields a fairly satisfactory translation: 'At that monastery she redeemed, by paying money, the villages which had been bought in the past and re-granted them to the same monastery.'[3] This passage seems to confirm the practice, referred to above, of monasteries 'acquiring villages'. The curious act of the queen in buying them back and re-granting them to the monastery was, one may surmise, a gentle means of expressing her disapproval of the practice.

In three instances the Cūlavaṃsa refers to a group of monks called lābhavāsins. Mahinda IV granted wealth to the lābhavāsin monks of the three nikāyas.[4] Vijayabāhu I assigned the villages Antaraviṭṭhi, Saṅghāta-

---

[1] EZ Vol. IV p. 206 ll. 8-9.

[2] Cv., 49.26.

[3] Geiger translates kītā as 'sold'. This is, obviously, incorrect. Cf. Cv., trsl. Pt. I, p.129.

[4] Cv., 54.-27.

gāmaka and Sirimaṇḍalagāma to lābhavāsin monks.[1] The first and the last of these villages were located in the modern Batticaloa and Kurunāgala districts respectively by C. W. Nicholas; he has also suggested that the second was in Rājaraṭṭha.[2] Vijayabāhu I also restored to the monasteries the villages in Rohaṇa which had been granted by previous kings for the supply of food for monks, for lābhavāsin monks and for the provision of offerings to stūpas.[3] No explanation of the term lābhavāsin has been given so far. It is important to note that they could belong to all the three nikāyas. It also seems that they were fairly wide-spread over the Island. Further, in all these three instances they are associated with a grant of a village or of wealth. In the last instance cited, they occur among other heads of expenditure at a monastery as provision of food for monks and payments to employees. These reasons as also the fact that the term lābhavāsin appears in the chronicle in the same period as the term lābhaladuvan in inscriptions make it very tempting to suppose that both terms referred to the same group of monks, i.e. those who were entitled to stipends. The tendency to consider monks who enjoyed personal incomes as belonging to a separate class is noticeable also in the Burmese chronicle Sāsanavaṃsa which refers to three types of monks: forest-dwellers, village-dwellers and 'recipients of the taxes on the fields and lands dedi-

[1] Cv., 60.68.

[2] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI pp. 35, 99, 192.

[3] Cv., 60.72-73.

cated to a monastery'.[1]

The mention of villages and incomes assigned to the lābhavāsins raises the question of the possibility of the development of personal property among the saṅgha. Among the numerous inscriptions recording the pious donations of the patrons of the saṅgha are found some donations by monks themselves. An inscription as far back as the third century A.D., found at Murutāṅge in the North-western province, records a gift of three hundred damakahavaṇu made by a monk called Saṅghatissa.[2] The tenth century Sanskrit record from the Kapārārāma mentions an endowment of two hundred ṭaṅkās by a certain sthavira Saṅghanandin for the supply of drinkables (pāṇiyārtham) to the monks of the Kapārārāma.[3] The generosity of these religieux points to their possession of fairly substantial incomes and suggests the possibility of their having had rights over property.

This possibility grows stronger when considered in the light of statements in the inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries. A regulation in the Jetavanārāma Sanskrit inscription prohibits the monks of that particular monastery from owning even a pāda of land in the Island.[4] It is very unlikely that such a regulation would have found its way into the short list of rules in this inscription if the question had not been of practical importance and relevance to those times. Further evidence is

---

[1] Sāsanavaṃsa (B.C.Law) p.92.

[2] CJSG Vol. II No. 381.

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 162-169.

[4] EZ Vol. I p. 4 ll.11-12.

available in the Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V where reference is made among various types of property belonging to the nikāya to saṅgsatu puṅgulsatu lābhayehi isā bajtuvāk gambimaṭ. This passage has been translated as 'the villages and land connected with the incomes (stipends) accruing to the clergy in common and to individual monks'. The same inscription decrees later on that residences made over to the clergy in common should not be converted into personal property.[1] These two statements are particularly noteworthy. For they reveal that a distinction was drawn between the property belonging to the monks in common and that which belonged to individuals. This distinction seems to have been strong enough to justify the provision of regulations prohibiting the conversion of 'common property' into 'personal property'.

Inscriptions do not provide sufficient evidence to help determine whether puṅgulsatu denoted ownership of property by individual monks or laymen. In clarifying this position, the Samantapāsādikā proves extremely helpful. In the Cullavaggavaṇṇanā of the Samantapāsādikā, Buddhaghosa lays down the procedure to be followed if the saṅgha found itself unable to maintain the buildings of the monasteries in good repair:

> 'It has been said in the Kurundi that if there is no wealth held in common by the saṅgha, one monk should be asked to look after the building and take the space for a bed in return. If he desires more, it should be protected even after giving a third or a half of it to him. And if he still pleads, "only the pillars remain; much work has to be done," the whole building may be given to him as his personal property (puggalikaṃ) ..... Such a building would be his personal

---

[1] saṅg kaḷa avas puṅgul nokaranu isā EZ Vol. I pp. 47-48 ll.28-29.

> property during his lifetime, but would become the property of the saṅgha (saṅghikaṃ) at his death. But if he wishes to leave it to his disciples, a third or a half may be given after examining the work done; it is permissible for him to leave this to his disciples.'[1]

Another passage from the same section of the Samantapāsādikā deals with the rights of monks who set up monastic dwellings:

> 'If a monk builds a hermitage for his personal use, on land belonging to the saṅgha in common, but with his own materials, without taking even a grain of sand belonging to the saṅgha, half of the building belongs to the saṅgha and the other half is his personal property. ... If he builds it with material belonging to the saṅgha, collected at the monastery, he is entitled to only a third... But if he sets up a building after filling and levelling very rough and uneven ground and cutting steps where there was none, the saṅgha has no claims on it.'[2]

These passages suggest that the inability of the monasteries to maintain all their buildings in good repair as well as the initiative of individual monks in building activities gave rise to some form of personal ownership among monks. But it is difficult to determine whether these statements of Buddhaghosa were prompted by realities of the times or whether they were merely logical possibilities considered by a commentator. Perhaps, they were a mixture of both. Even if it is conceded that they were mere logical possibilities, it is seen that during the course of this discussion Buddhaghosa accepted the idea of ownership of property by individual monks. Secondly the recurrence of these terms in the later inscriptions show that they had been translated into real terms at least by

---

[1] Smp., p. 1246.

[2] Smp., p. 1246-1247.

the tenth century. The discussion of Buddhaghosa brings out the significance of the terms saṅgsatu and puṅgulsatu in the inscriptions and leaves little doubt that the latter was used with reference to the personal property of monks and not of laymen.

However, the evidence cited above does not indicate an actual instance of land being held by individual monks though they strongly suggest this possibility. The Samantapāsādikā discusses only the ownership of monastic buildings. Perhaps, the idea of ownership of land was not yet known. In this connection, an inscription from Buddannehäla, dated in the third year of a king identified as Kassapa V, is of considerable importance. According to this record, the rights to a certain allotment of land amounting to six kiri in extent were vested in the monk Harse, the incumbent of the hermitage of Nāgirigala and not in the institution itself. After his demise these rights were to devolve upon Buddhamitra who is described as the 'son by consecration ' (abhiṣekayen daru) of the former. And on the death of the latter they were to be enjoyed by a person appointed by the abbot of the Cetiyagiri monastery.[1] The fact that this is the only inscription of its typefound so far may suggest that this was an uncommon practice. But it does not appear so uncommon when considered in the light of the evidence of the Samantapāsādikā cited earlier. Further, it provides an actual instance of ownership of property by individual monks but also of 'inheritance' by 'spiritual sons' and hence is a remarkable corroboration of the evidence found in the Samanta-

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 191-200.

pāsādikā.

Further evidence is found in an inscription from Koṭṭaṅge, dating from about the early decades of the thirteenth century, according to which the mahāthera Abhaya ... of Vilagammuḷa granted three pieces of land including the pamuṇu of Kalam to the saṅgha.[1] An earlier inscription from the same place reveals that the pamuṇu of Kalam had been granted by Lokeśvara to Loke Aramēnā, a general, for valour shown in campaigns against the Coḷas.[2] The land in question could have come to be possessed by the monk in any one of three different ways. First, he could have owned the land before he entered the Order. This would imply that the land had been in his possession for a long time, as he was a mahāthera by the time he made this grant. Second, the right could have devolved upon him through inheritance after he joined the Order. This explanation recognizes the right of a monk to inherit property. Third, he could have been offered the land. Even if it were so, he seems to have made the grant some time later as he refers to the land as belonging to him (tamanvahansege) and not what he had recently received.

Corroborative evidence is found also in a later passage of the Cūḷavaṃsa. In order to restore the property of monasteries confiscated by his predecessors, it is said that Parakkamabāhu II caused to be determined the villages which had been assigned for the provision of 'priestly requisites' (paccayagāmaka) and those which belonged to monks in common (gaṇasanta-

[1] EZ Vol. IV pp. 82-90 No. 2.

[2] EZ Vol. IV pp. 82-90 No. 1.

kagāma) and to individuals (puggalikagāma).[1] This reference to puggalikagāma reiterates the idea of individual ownership and also suggests that villages, too, were involved. On the basis of this evidence it is not altogether unjustified to contend that a part of the property assigned to the community of monks was enjoyed by certain monks of this period as their personal property.

The appearance of the practice of ownership of property by individual monks would suggest that Buddhist monks, in spite of the ideal they set for themselves, were, by the period under consideration, drawn into very close association with the lay society so that some of the salient features of lay life were introduced into the life of monks. But it would be unwise to believe that monks had the same rights over their personal property as the laymen did. The use of the term 'ownership' raises a number of difficult and in some cases unanswerable questions. It is not clear how far the rights of these 'owners' extended. The property owned by the mahāthera Abhaya ... of Vilgammuḷa, mentioned above is termed pamuṇu and involved 'the most complete ownership possible within the tenure system'.[2] Evidently, the right of alienation in the sense of transfer to the saṅgha was known; but it is not clear whether a monk could transfer his property to a layman as a sale or a gift.

'Ownership' did not involve personal management. It merely entitled the owner to the income from the property which would have been administered

[1] Cv., 84.3-4.

[2] See p.190.

in the usual manner by monastic officials.[1] The right was limited also by residence qualifications. A tenth century inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery states that monks were not entitled to their incomes if they left the Order.[2] Further, both this inscription and the Mihintale Tablets add that the income accruing from the villages and the land belonging to the monastery should be enjoyed only by the regular residents of the monastery.[3]

As pointed out earlier, the personal property of a monk would normally revert to the saṅgha after his death. It is noteworthy, however, that he could leave his property to his disciples. This finds confirmation even in the account of I-tsing where he deals with the procedure followed in the Western regions he visited in dealing with the property of deceased monks: 'First of all an inquiry should be made as to whether there are any debts, whether the deceased left a will, and also if anyone nursed him while ill. If there be such, the property must be distributed in accordance with the law. Any property remaining must be suitably divided... Lands, houses, shops... village gardens, buildings which are immovable become the property of the assembly.'[4]

Though ownership of property was at times vested in individual monks all such sources of income were considered to be the property of the respective monasteries and ultimately of the nikāyas. Several inscriptions

[1] See EZ Vol. I p.239.

[2] EZ Vol. I p. 235 l. 25; p.236 ll.37-38.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.91. ll.A15-16.

[4] I-tsing p.189-190.

of this period refer to the 'property of the three nikāyas'.[1] A tenth century inscription from Diyurumvela refers to a village in the Malaya region owned by the Abhayagiri nikāya.[2] The Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V records the grant of immunities made to all the lands and villages belonging to the whole Abhayagiri nikāya.[3] Evidently, all the land belonging to a nikāya was considered as forming one unit, for administrative purposes. Further, as will be discussed in the next chapter, the main monastery of the nikāya had a close supervisory control over the administration of the property of the hermitages belonging to the nikāya; these hermitages had to submit their annual statements of accounts for approval by the monks of the main monastery.[4] Hence, in the ninth and tenth centuries, the nikāya was not merely a fraternity of monks subscribing to a particular school of thought; it was also a body which owned a vast extent of land and had supervisory control over these lands through institutions representing the nikāya spread over many parts of the Island.

The fifty-three years of Coḷa rule over Rājaraṭṭha which followed the fall of Anurādhpura was a period of constant warfare between the Coḷas and the succession of petty rulers who rose to power in Rohaṇa and Dakkiṇadesa. In these years of political disorder monastic property would have been subjected to plunder and confiscation by war-leaders in need of funds

[1] EZ Vol. IV p. 42 ll. C13-14.

[2] CJSG., Vol. II No. 635.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp.41-57.

[4] See pp.165-166

to replenish their treasuries; and whatever was left could easily lapse into the hands of monastic officials and tenants.

It is the misdeeds of the Coḷas which are highlighted in the Cūḷavaṃsa when the chronicler draws a picture of rapacious plunder and destruction: 'They plundered many costly images of gold from the shrines of the three nikāyas in all Laṅkā, violently destroyed all monasteries in different parts of the land and like blood-sucking yakkhas pillaged Laṅkā of its wealth.'[1] It is quite possible that the Coḷas plundered the wealth of the monasteries and transferred monastic property to the Śaiva temples they built in Ceylon and South India. However, apart from the vague statement in the chronicle quoted above, there is no concrete evidence to support either of these suppositions. Vijayabāhu I is said to have restored to the saṅgha the property granted to them by previous kings.[2] This would imply that monastic property had been confiscated or that their ownership had lapsed during the preceding period; but this was a statement made with reference to Rohaṇa which was the centre of the Sinhalese resistance to Coḷa rule.

More evidence on the fate of the property of monks in Rohaṇa is found in another strophe in the Cūḷavaṃsa. Kassapa, son of Mahinda V, is said to have offered, after a victorious campaign against the Coḷas, a boon to his generals. In this connection, it is said,

---

[1] Cv., 55.20, 21.

[2] See p.119

Buddho so pavenigāmaṃ varaṃ yācittha, Kittiko
saṅghikaṃ gahitaṃ bhāgaṃ vissajjetuṃ varaṃ vari.[1]

Geiger rendered this strophe into English as follows: 'Buddha asked as
w
wish for the village in which his family dwelt; Kitti chose as wish that the part of his revenues which the bhikkhu community had appropriated might be remitted.' The second part of this passage is particularly striking. It seems rather strange that the monks had succeeded in appropriating the revenues of none other than one of the foremost military leaders of the Sinhalese at the time. Even if the Buddhist monks were audacious enough to think of such an act unworthy of their position, a general would be an unlikely victim. Secondly even if this was what the chronicler meant, the phrase saṅghikaṃ gahitaṃ would have been a rather inappropriate grammatical form to convey this sense. Hence, the second part of this strophe, it seems, demands a different interpretation. Both the words saṅghikaṃ and gahitaṃ in this pāda qualify the term bhāgaṃ. Considering this fact, this pāda can be translated without any strain on the meaning or the construction of the strophe as, 'Kittika chose as wish that the incomes of the saṅgha which had been appropriated be restored.' This evidently refers to the area which was under Kassapa's control. The 'incomes of the saṅgha' mentioned in this strophe could have been confiscated by Kassapa or by the Coḷas who had occupied Rohaṇa for six months till the end of these campaigns. One may surmise on the basis of this evidence, that the saṅgha suffered from deprivation of their property even in the regions outside Rājaraṭṭha during this period of constant warfare and political disorder.

[1] Cv., 55.31.

The accession of Vijayabāhu I to the throne of Ceylon and the establishment of peace and order ushered in a period of prosperity for the saṅgha. The Cūlvaṃsa devotes an entire chapter to the description of the work of the king for the welfare of the saṅgha and the laity. Restorations and fresh grants of villages to about twenty-one monasteries occur in the chronicle. Of these Bhallātaka, Jambukola, Kurundiya, Mahāsena, Maṇḍalagiri, Paragāmaka, Paṭṭiṇa and Sittalagāma may be located in Rājaraṭṭha, Candanagiri, Devanagara, Kāsagalla, Madhutthala, Mahiyaṅgaṇa, Rakkhacetiyapabbata and Buddhaguṇa in Rohaṇa, Paṇḍuvāpi in Dakkhiṇadesa and the Jambukola cave monastery in Malayadesa.[1] His patronage of the lābhavāsin and vantajīvin monks has already been mentioned.[2]

The shrine on the mount of Samanoḷa was another place which benefited from the generosity of Vijayabāhu. The Cūlavaṃsa mentions the grant of the village Gilīmalaya and its fields of sāli paddy for the provision of alms to pilgrims visiting the shrine.[3] The Ambagamuva inscription records a grant, made to the same shrine, of a plantation of areca in Kehelgamuva, another in udu-ho (upper bank of the stream) and allotments of land in Tiniyagal, Soragoḍa, Liyavaḷa, in the forests of Badulla as well as in Makuḷmula, Aṁbagamuva, Väligampola and Ulapaṇā all of which were attached to Kalaṅguvela.[4]

---

[1] Cv., 60.58-63, 81; JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI pp. 48, 57, 61, 70, 71, 80, 83, 86, 104, 108, 183, 188, 191, 192.

[2] See pp. 44, 108.

[3] Cv., 60.64-67.

[4] EZ Vol. II p.214 ll. B38-43.

Yet, undoubtedly the most extensive donation of Vijayabāhu I was the endowment he made to the monastery he built for the monks of the three nikāyas.[1] According to Geiger's translation, 'he granted to the community the whole district of Āḷisāra to gether with the canal-diggers dwelling there'. But the original strophe runs as follows:

Saṅghassa pākavaṭṭattham raṭṭham datvāḷisārakam
sakalam tam nivasihi nettikehi saheva ca

It may be pointed out that the occurrence of ca in the last pāda precludes Geiger's assumption that the term tam nivāsihi qualified nettikehi. The two terms will have to be taken as separate. Nettika occurs in the Dhammapada.[2] The Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, commenting on this particular strophe, suggests that it denotes 'a workman engaged in irrigational activities'.[3] But it is quite possible, as Rhys Davids pointed out,[4] that the term also meant 'a conduit for irrigation'. In fact, Āḷisāraraṭṭha was an area with a number of irrigation works and was presumably named after the largest and the most important of them. If we, therefore, accept the second meaning of the term, the translation will have to be modified to read as follows: 'For the provision of food, he granted to the community the whole district of Āḷisāra together with its residents and canals.'

It is interesting that the residents of the district, too, were given

---

[1] Cv., 60.14.

[2] Dhammapada v.80.

[3] Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (PTS) Vol. II p.147.

[4] Pali-English Dictionary (PTS)

over to the monastery. Several Indian inscriptions record similar grants.[1] In practice this would have meant merely that the rights to labour usually enjoyed by the king were now transferred to the monastery. But the most noteworthy feature about this grant is the vastness of the area granted. The account of the campaigns of Parakkamabāhu I in the Cūlavaṃsa shows that the district of Āḷisāra comprised a number of villages including Taḷatthāla, Āḷigāma and probably Kaddūragāma, Kiraṭi, Vilāna, Mattikavāpi, Uddhaṅkuragāma, Adhokuraṅgāma and Nāsinna.[2] In addition, the grant probably covered the right to the income from the great Āḷisāra canal with its tributaries. There is no evidence on the exact extent of the rights of the monastery over the land granted to it. But there is little doubt that the income of the monastery was quite substantial. It is unfortunate that the identity of this monastery which was held in such high esteem by Vijayabāhu I has not been preserved in our sources. It may be presumed, on the strength of the foregoing account, that the Buddhist monasteries of the three main nikāyas were well endowed during the reigns of Vijayabāhu even if their prosperity did not equal the standards of the period prior tothe Coḷa occupation.

With the death of Vijayabāhu the political unity of the Island was lost, and there began a period of protracted warfare bringing widespread devastation to the three independent kingdoms which arose in Rājaraṭṭha, Ruhaṇa and Dakkhiṇadesa. These dimunitive kingdoms could not support such

---

[1] For example see the grant of a village together with its inhabitants (sa-prathivivasijana-sametaṃ) in the Nirmand Copper Plate CII Vol.III p.288 l.10

[2] Cv., 70.106-112, 162-172.

warfare and in the words of the chronicler their rulers 'squeezed out the whole people as sugar-cane in a sugar mill, by levying excessive taxes'.[1] Under these straitened circumstances it was natural that they would look at the wealth of monasteries with covetous eyes. Further, one of the rulers who ascended the throne of Polonnaruva, Vikkamabāhu I (1111-1132), sons of Vijayabāhu I, had reasons to be disgruntled with the saṅgha. For, in selecting the king and the uparāja after the death of Vijayabāhu I, they had ignored his own claims.[2]

A posthumous inscription of Vijayabāhu from Polonnaruva records an agreement between a certain mahāsthavira Mugalan of the Uturuḷamuḷa and the Mahātantra, Valañjiyār and Nagarattār sections of the Velaikkāra army.[3] In accordance with this agreement the Velaikkāras would assign men for the protection of the shrine of the Tooth relic. Further, they bound themselves to protect the villages, servants and the treasures of the shrine, to protect men seeking shelter in its immunity, to provide all its requirements and to maintain it in good repair. They even gave the shrine a new name: Mūṉṟu-kai-tiru-Velaikkāran-Daḷadāy-pperumpalli (i.e. the great shrine of the Tooth relic of the Velaikkāras of the three divisions). It is clear from this passage that the Velaikkāras took over virtually the complete control of the shrine and its properties.

---

[1] Cv., 61.53.

[2] See p.299.

[3] EI Vol. XVIII p.338.

This is the first instance in Ceylon of the saṅgha seeking the help of mercenary troops for the protection of its property and its rights. The saṅgha wouldhave found themselves in very severe straits to be forced to take this unusual step.

In his edition of the inscription, Wickremasinghe comments, 'It is conceivable that between 1137 and 1153 A.D., that is to say either at the end of Vikkamabāhu's reign, or at the beginning of that of his son Gajabāhu, both of whom were no friends of the Buddhist church, Moggallāna fearing that the king might lay his devastating hands on the rich Tooth-relic temple, then containing the Tooth- and Bowl-relics that were originally at Moggallāna's own Uttarola vihāra, at Abhayagiri, prevailed upon the powerful Vellaikkāras to take over the full custody of the temple and fled southwards to Rohaṇa or the Yuvarāja's country.'[1] In dating this inscription, Wickremasinghe was partly guided by his identification of Mugalan of this inscription with Moggallāna, the lexicographer who lived in the time of Parakkamabāhu I. There are several difficulties which precluded such an identification, which will be discussed in due course.[2] Here it should suffice to cite certain facts which point to the improbability of this dating.

The Cūlavaṃsa states in very precise terms that it was Vikkamabāhu who confiscated the wealth of the shrine of the Tooth relic. Hence this record has to be dated to a period prior to that event; there is no basis

[1] EZ Vol. II pp. 249-50.

[2] See p. 470-472.

for dating it to the reign of Gajabāhu II. Secondly it appears rather unlikely that Vikkamabāhu with his grievances againstthe saṅgha would have waited till the end of his twenty-one year long reign to take measures against the monasteries. Further, if the record dates from so late a period, it would be very strange that it speaks of the reign of Vijayabāhu in great detail and makes no mention at all of Vikkamabāhu. Certain facts in the inscription lend colour to our view. The Velaikkāra army which bound itself to protect the property of the shrine was in all probability in the service of the king. It is also stated that they were summoned by mahāsthavira Mugalan who was in the company of king's ministers (rāj-amātyaroḍuṅ-kūḍa). It is very unlikely that the Velaikkāras would have entered into such an agreement if it was the king who intended to appropriate the wealth of the shrine. Even if they did so, it is more improbable that the king's ministers would have taken part in the deliberations which led to this agreement and stated so in a public document. Moreover, if the mercenary army and the ministers were opposed to the idea of confiscating monastic property, it is not likely that Vikkamabāhu would have succeeded in his attempt as he in fact did. On considering that only Vijayabāhu is referred to in this record, it appears that it possibly belonged to the period between the death of Vijayabāhu and the accession of Vikkamabāhu. It may be suggested that the monks were forced to take these unprecedented measures to ensure the protection of their property and of their rights during these unsettled times markedby constant warfare, particularly when they realised the possibility of Vikkamabāhu, whose in-

terests they had forsaken, emerging victorious. If the plausibilityof these arguments is accepted, this inscription can be precisely dated. For the period between the death of Vijayabāhu and the accession of Vikkamabāhu lasted only about a year, i.e. A. D. c. 1110-1111.[1]

It is possible that the Sanskrit inscription from Padaviya which records that the Buddhist monastery at the site was taken under the protection of the Velaikkāras also belongs to this period.[2] These precautions, however, proved to be of no avail. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, Vikkamabāhu confiscated the precious stones and pearls offered to the Alms Bowl and the Tooth relic of the Buddha. He also appropriated the 'maintenance villages', golden images and offerings of sandalwood, aloes and camphor belonging to the saṅgha.[3] But there is no mention of any opposition offered by the Velaikkāras placed in charge of the shrine of the Tooth relic. They may have belonged to the factinn which was defeated by Vikkamabāhu in the struggle for the throne. Even if they were by this time in the employ of Vikkamabāhu, they had no reason to complain. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, the king distributed the 'maintenance villages' of the saṅgha among his followers and converted the monasteries into barracks for his foreign soldiers.

The spoliation of monasteries was not entirely unprecedented. Foreign invaders were not the only people responsible for such measures. The

[1] This dating is based on Paranavitana's chronology. See UHC Vol. I P5. II. pp. 843-847.

[2] ARASC 1953 p.19.

[3] Cv., 61.54-61.

chronicles refer to confiscations of monastic property in the reigns of Kuñcanāga (? 187-189 A.D.) and Dāṭhopatissa I (639-650) by participants in civil wars to raise funds for their campaigns.[1] But it was in the reign of Vikkamabāhu that a confiscation of monastic property was carried out by a Sinhalese king on a large scale to affect all the major establishments of the saṅgha.

Unlike certain confiscations of monastic property like the Hui Chang Suppression in Chinese Buddhism[2] it does not seem to have been an attempt to control the number of monks or the extent of the wealth of the monasteries. Apparently, no attempt was made to laicize monks. Though Vikkamabāhu seems to have patronized the Śaiva faith,[3] there is no evidence to believe that this action amounted to a persecution of Buddhism in favour of any other faith. It would have been partly a political vendetta, but mainly a measure prompted by pecuniary needs. There is little doubt, however, that the action of the king was felt deep in the organization of the saṅgha. The loss of their wealth brought together the various fraternities of the saṅgha, despite the traditional differences which divided them, in a concerted move of censure against the king. In the words of the chronicler, '... the ascetics in the eight chief vihāras looked up to as people worthy of honour, and the pāṃsukūlika bhikkhus belonging to the

[1] Shsvp., pp. 21-22; Cv., 44.131-134, 140.

[2] See K. Chen, 'The economic background of the Hui Chang Suppression of Buddhism', Harvard Jnl. of Asn. Stud. Vol. 19, 1956, pp. 67 ff. See also p.253.

[3] See p.290.

two divisions, were wroth at the matter and thinking it were better to remove themselves from the vicinity of people like those erring from the faith, wrought in this way so much evil against the Order, they took the sacred Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl Relic, betook themselves to Rohaṇa and settled themselves here and there where it pleased them.'[1] Perhaps they were thinking of the instance when the monks of Tapovana took a similar measure against the king, with successful results, in the reign of Udaya III.[2] This time it was not a mere section of the saṅgha that was affected. The account of the Cūlavaṃsa points to a mass exodus to Rohaṇa of monks from the main fraternities at the capital. They took with them two relics which were increasingly gaining prominence as symbols of sovereignty. This was indeed a situation fraught with calamitous potentialities endangering the position and the security of the king.

Curiously enough no uprising which embarrassed Vikkamabāhu is recorded in the chronicles. It is not impossible that the growth of the wealth of the monasteries and the unwise participation in political affairs by monks had roused some resentment among the laity who, even if they did not acquiesce in the actions of the king, saw no reason to oppose him. It is also possible that, contrary to the statements in the chronicle, not all the monasteries were affected by this act. Some monks would have continued to stay in the capital and its vicinity. A fragmentary inscription of Sundaramahādevī, the queen of Vikkamabāhu, refers to Ānanda,

[1] Cv., 61.58-61.

[2] See pp. 296-297.

described as a monk of great renown, who was presumably patronized by her.[1] Another inscription of the same lady, dated in the sixth year of Gajabāhu II, shows that the Diṁbulāgala fraternity, a leading centre of the Araññika sect, continued to flourish during this reign.[2] Most probably the monastery was occupied during the reign of Vikkamabāhu, too. Thus, the flight of monks to Rohaṇa failed to bring about the repercussions that could have been expected.

If the monks expected better treatment in Rohaṇa, they were disappointed before long. Mānābharaṇa who succeeded Sirivallabha as the ruler of Rohaṇa was as much in need of funds as Vikkamabāhu was. According to the Cūḷavaṁsa, he seized the wealth assigned to the Tooth relic and the villages belonging to the monks.[3] His reign, however, was not entirely unmarked by generosity. In an inscription dated in c. 1145 A.D., he granted land, thirteen amuṇas in extent, to a monastery called Talāmuhundgiri.[4]

In the context of this chapter, the reign of Vikkamabāhu appears to be significant for two important reasons. Firstly, the major monasteries seem to have been shorn of a considerable part of their wealth. Secondly, this brought forth in response concerted action on the part of the saṅgha

---

[1] EZ Vol. IV pp. 67-72.

[2] EZ Vol. II pp. 194-202.

[3] Cv., 72.304-305.

[4] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 142-146.

despite the differences which usually kept them apart. It is also noteworthy that the account of the reign of Gajabāhu in the Cūlavaṃsa as well as inscriptions datable to his reign contain no reference to any attempts by the king to grant land or to restore the property confiscated by his predecessors.

The Cūlavaṃsa mentions that Parakkamabāhu I accommodated the representatives of the eight āyatanas in the Jetavana monastery at Polonnaruva.[1] Even if their original possessions were not restored, the king had at least to provide a source of income for this monastery and the six other monasteries he built at Polonnaruva. The chronicle makes no mention of any such endowment. But according to the Pūjāvaliya, he granted to these monks polonnaru verupetin vaṭanāpasa.[2] The relevant meanings of the term pasa are 'requisites', 'side' and 'section'. Varupet occurs in the Saddharmaratnāvalī to denote 'fields'.[3] Hence the phrase may be translated into English as 'valuable allotments from the fields of Polonnaruva' or 'costly "requisites" from (the income of) the fields of Polonnaruva'. Further, if the dating of the Galpāṭavihāra inscription to the reign of Parakkamabāhu I[4] is accepted, it would appear that the fields and the coconut and areca palms of the allotments of Siyaṃbalāpāya, Tiṅgavaṭu, Tiratanayāvatta, Isanavītivatta, Panäspolvatta,

[1] Cv., 78, 32-34.

[2] Pjv., p.106.

[3] Saddharmaratanāvalī (Jayatilaka ed.) pp. 393, 712.

[4] EZ Vol. IV pp. 196-200; 205-207 ll. 5-23.

Kosgalogoḍa, Mo...goḍa, ... luganto̱avatta, Dharmananda and Mānaduṽa islands, Bolutuḍāva and Beravāgoḍa were granted to the Galpāta monastery. But if indeed Parakkamabāhu was responsible for the restoration of the wealth of the monasteries, confiscated by his predecessors, the author of the Cūlavaṃsa who made a deliberate attempt to present his hero in true heroic proportions would hardly have missed the opportunity to describe this deed in all its detail. The failure of Parakkamabāhu to bring about such a restoratinn is implicit also in the Bhagavālena inscription of Nissaṅka Malla, where he claims to have restored to the shrine of Samanoḷa, several villages including Aṁbagamuva which originally belonged to this shrine but had been confiscated by his predecessors.[1] Evidently, it is referring to a confiscation which took place after the reign of Vijayabāhu I who granted the village Aṁbagamuva to this shrine. Apparently, the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, though rightly renowned for the generous patronage of the saṅgha, did not bring about the restoration of monastic wealth in a manner which equalled their former prosperity.

---

[1] CJSG Vol. II No. 376.

Chapter 3

THE ADMINISTRATION OF MONASTIC PROPERTY

"The paradox of all rational asceticism,' Weber observed, 'which in an identical manner has made monks in all ages stumble, is that rational asceticism itself has created the very wealth it rejected. Temples and monasteries have everywhere become the very loci of all rational economies.'[1] The accumulation of wealth by the Sinhalese saṅgha, which was the result of a long period of munificent patronage by all ranks of the society, confronted them with the same paradox that Weber so clearly outlined. The rules of discipline embodied in the Vinaya Piṭaka were strict in directing monks to refrain from all profane activities including acceptance, management and enjoyment of material wealth. But the main monasteries at the capital and the minor hermitages which accepted their leadership, as well as even individual monks had come to own, apart from movable property, a vast extent of fields, land and irrigation works.

The need to resolve this dichotomy between theory and practice had, by the time of Buddhaghosa, attracted the attention of the commentators on the Vinaya. The statements of Buddhaghosa reveal a liberal and compromising attitude in his approach to the problem: 'It behoves not for the bhikkhusaṅgha to administer, accept or consent to the acceptance of any immovable property like a field, landholding, tank or a canal. But it is permissible to accept "allowable" articles [2] from the proceeds of

---

[1] H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber, 1961, p.332.

[2] See p.74 n.1.

such property, if they be administered by a kappiyakāraka.'[1] This statement is further illustrated and clarified by other passages,[2] which lay down that it was through a kappiyakāraka - a layman - that a monk should accept and manage property donated for the maintenance of the saṅgha. Thus the need to reconcile ownership of wealth with the pursuance of ascetic ideals as prescribed in the Vinaya necessitated the employment of a class of administrators for the management of monastic property.

Apart from these theoretical reasons there were other, equally important, practical considerations which made it essential for the saṅgha to employ a body of regular officials for the administration of the monasteries. The possessions of the monasteries covered a wide range including land, fields, irrigation works, salterns and cattle. Some of these land grants were quite extensive. Several of them were situated at considerable distances from the monasteries to which they were granted.

A parivena of the Mahāvihāra owned an allotment of land in Muhundnaru in the Eastern Quarter, about fifty miles from Anurādhapura.[3] The Sen Senevirad Pirivena owned some land in Posonavulla, one and a half miles to the east of Tittagonnāva in the Kuñcuṭṭu Korale as well as in Gālinduru Gomaṇḍala, three miles further away to the north east.[4] The latter was about forty miles from Anurādhapura. The Bahaduru Sen Pirivena, also of

---

[1] Smp., p.1238.

[2] See Smp., pp. 677, 678, 680, 681, 691.

[3] EZ Vol. IV pp. 59-67.

[4] EZ Vol. I pp. 163-171, 171-173.

the Mahāvihāra, held rights to three villages by the coast, probably close to Mannar and more than fifty miles from the city.[1] A piece of land, irrigated by the Padonnaru tank in Moragoḍa, more than forty miles from Anurādhapura, belonged to the Maṅgul Pirivena of the Abhayagiri monastery.[2] Similarly, the Sirisangbo Pirivena of the Jetavana monastery owned Velaṅgama, a village situated eleven miles to the north of Madavacciya and therefore about twenty five miles from the monastery. It is evident from this that the monastery of this period was faced with the difficult problem of administering possessions situated more than fifty miles away; the possessions of the Mahāvihāra were scattered over a wide area extending to more than fifty miles in the east, forty in the north-east and fifty miles to the west.

The administrative problems of the monasteries would have become more complicated during the last three centuries of the first millennium which saw the profusion of grants of immunities exempting from taxation and official interference the villages and the land allotments of the monasteries.[3] The consequent transfer to the monasteries of the control of at least some of the villages should possibly have brought the traditional officials of the village under the authority of the monastery. On the other hand, the monastery itself would have had to adjust its administrative set-up to carry out the new responsibilities it had come to

---

[1] EZ Vol. III pp. 100-113.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 200-207.

[3] See ch. 5.

assume.

Further, the demands of the day-to-day internal administration of large monasteries, which included the provision of the necessities of the monks and the erection and maintenance of buildings, would have paved the way to the emergence of the practice of employing laymen in the monastic administration from the earliest times. In fact, mention of this practice occurs in later sections of the Vinaya Piṭaka. The Mahāvagga contains a story about king Bimbisāra who, on seeing the monk Pilindavaccha levelling a slope to erect a dwelling, was moved to offer him five hundred men as ārāmikas. They formed a village alternatively called ārāmikagāma and Pilindagāma after the name of the monk.[1] Similarly, an incidental reference to kappiyakārakas is found in the Sutta-vibhaṅga where it is stated that monks should not make purchases by themselves but should have the transaction conducted through kappiyakārakas.[2] The Pali chronicles of Ceylon record that local kings provided the saṅgha with attendants of both these types. The Cūlavaṃsa refers to ārāmikas for the first time in connection with the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328 A.D.)[3] Buddhadāsa (337-365) granted kappiyakārakas to monks who propounded the dhamma.[4]

Geiger held the view that the two terms ārāmika and kappiyakāraka were identical in meaning.[5] The first occurs in several Buddhist Sanskrit

[1] Vinaya Pitaka (PTS) Vol. I pp. 206-209.

[2] Smp., see pp. 698-9.

[3] Cv., 37.63.

[4] Cv., 37.173.

[5] Cv., trsl. Vol. I p.16 n.4.

texts.[1] The term kalpikāra found in the Divyāvadāna is probably the equivalent of kappiyakāraka as Edgerton has suggested.[2] In none of these sources is there sufficient evidence to draw a clear distinction between the two terms. However, their adjacent incidence and the contexts in which they occur in the Pali works of Ceylon, especially the Samantapāsādikā, suggest that their meaning varied.

The ārāmikas that Aggabodhi IV granted to the monk Dāṭhāsiva are said to have been the king's own relatives,[3] but this does not necessarily mean that they were expected to hold a high position. A passage in the Timsakavaṇṇanā of the Samantapāsādikā shows that even slaves and bondmen belonging to the monasteries were called ārāmikas. According to this, if a dyer (rajakadāsa) or a weaver (pesakāradāsa) were to be offered to the saṅgha, they could accept him as an ārāmika.[4]

In certain contexts ārāmikas occur as minor employees and functionaries of themonastery. According to the Duggatitthiyāvatthu of the Sahassavatthupakaraṇa, a king sends for the chief ārāmika of the monastery to question him about the decorations at the monastery.[5] The Sīhalavatthupakaraṇa contains two stories in which ārāmikas figure as the employees in charge of the store of provisions and those responsible for the preparation of meals.[6] There is an interesting story in the Samantapāsādikā about a

---

[1] cf. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, Vol. II, p.104.

[2] Divy. 343.15; Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, Vol. II p.173.

[3] Cv., 46.14.

[4] Smp., p.683.

[5] Shsvp., p.63.

[6] Sihvp., pp. 47, 50-51.

monk who, being dissatisfied with the food he received, tried to indicate by signs the size of a cake that he would like the ārāmikas to bake for him.[1]

In another story in the Cūḷvaṃsa, the gods appeared before Aggabodhi II in a dream in the guise of ārāmikas, and threatened to take away the sacred relics of the Thūpārāma if the king did not expedite the work of restoring the stūpa.[2] This could imply that the ārāmikas were supposed to be placed in charge of the protection of the relics. If this were so, the guardians of relics and relic shrines that the kings appointed from time to time also belonged to this category. The Sāratthadīpanī points out in a discussion of the comparative merits of various types of monastic dwellings that monks living at large monasteries were liable to disturbances by ārāmikas who brought ears of paddy to demonstrate the excellence of their acehivements.[3] From this it would appear that even those who tilled the land of the monastery were called ārāmikas.

It is clear from this discussion that ārāmika was a comprehensive term which covered a wide variety of workmen and employees attached to the monastery. The fact that they were, at times, granted in large numbers also supports this observation. Aggabodhi I granted a hundred ārāmikas to the Kandavihāra.[4] Jeṭṭhā, the queen of Aggabodhi IV, also granted a hundred

---

[1] Smp., p.681.

[2] Cv., 42.54-55.

[3] Sāratthadīpanī p.562.

[4] Cv., 42.16.

ārāmikas to the Jetṭhārāma.[1] Kassapa IV granted ārāmikagāmas to the hermitages he built;[2] such grants, when considered in the light of the passage from the Mahāvagga cited earlier, would imply that the inhabitants of these villages were expected to serve at the monasteries. Some of the ārāmikas, as evident from the Samantapāsādikā, worked daily, the whole day or half a day, some once in five days and others once in a fortnight; they were given food and an allowance (nivāpa) accordingly.[3]

The kappiyakāraka was primarily the person who procured the necessities of the saṅgha through purchase or barter and made these articles 'allowable' (kappiya) by formally offering them to the saṅgha. In the early days, and in the lesser monasteries even in later times, the distinction between the kappiyakāraka and those employees who attended to lesser domestic duties would not have been very pronounced. But the services of a kappiyakāraka became most important and necessary when the saṅgha came to own such items of property as money, land and irrigation works which were not considered 'allowable'. According to the Samantapāsādikā, it was the kappiyakāraka who accepted and administered them on behalf of the saṅgha and diverted the proceeds to the provision of 'allowable articles'.[4] The practice of diverting a disproportionate share of the produce of monastic lands to their own use seems to have been a

---

[1] Cv., 46.20.

[2] Cv., 52.16.

[3] Smp., p.683; for nivāpa see p.190

[4] Smp., p.1238; see also p.74 n.1.

common complaint against the kappiyakārakas.[1] Some of them were placed in charge of irrigation tanks belonging to monasteries, presumably to collect the water dues. In this context it may be noted that in the only instance of the occurrence of this term in the Cūlavamsa, kappiyakārakas were allocated to monks who had received grants of bhoga, obviously because they were needed to administer the wealth or the revenues which were being transferred. Thus in the light shed by the Pali works, the kappiyakāraka appears as the official placed in charge of the wealth of the monastery. The importance of his position in the organization of the monastery as well as his responsibilities would have grown pari passu with the expansion of the possessions of the monastery.

The elaborate organization of monastic administration evident in the records of the ninth and tenth centuries undoubtedly represent a later stage of a long process of evolution. Its origin probably lay in the simpler administrative arrangements represented by the ārāmikas and the kappiyakārakas. It is possible that some of these employees were appointed by monks.[2] Sometimes people with no means of livelihood found employment as kappiyakārakas.[3] Some were bondmen donated by the lay patrons of the saṅgha. It is also significant that in many instances monastic employees were appointed by kings. For this could have helped to introduce features common to the administrative institutions of the

---

[1] See p. 73

[2] See e.g. Smp., p.673.

[3] Smp, p.1001.

state into the organization of monasteries.

The utilization and the interpretation of the epigraphic material available on the administration of monasteries is beset with several difficulties. The most notable of these is the paucity of evidence on the organization of the Mahāvihāra and the Jetavana nikāyas. Almost all the records belong to the Abhayagiri monastery and the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale. The inscriptions from Mihintale are the most important as they provide a fairly detailed picture of the organization and the working of the administrative system of a monastery.

The similarity of the social and economic milieux and, therefore, of the problems that the monasteries were confronted with should have led, one may surmise, to the growth of a basically similar administrative organization at all these monasteries. However, in spite of a possible basic similarity, various factors like the degree of evolution, differences in attitude prompted by doctrinal inclination and divergence of outside influences would have brought in significantly different features. In this context, it is noteworthy that the Mihintale Tablets state that the list of rules and regulations they contain was selected after a comparison of those which had been current at the Abhayagiri and the Cetiyagiri monasteries.[1] The dissimilarity of the two systems, vaguely implicit in this statement, becomes a credible fact when a comparative study of the administrative arrangements of the two monasteries is made.[2]

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.91 l.A6

[2] See pp.164 ff.

The divergence which prevailed in the organization of these two monasteries, in spite of the similarity of doctrinal inclination and the administrative links which connected them, is an apt illustration of the dangers which shadow attempts at generalization.

The Mihintale Tablets, which contain a list of the employees of the monastery together with the remuneration they received and detailed instructions on the management of administrative affairs, reveal an elaborate organization at the head of which was a committee of management called the kamtän. It was composed of eight members: i) nakā balana himiyan, ii) veher pirivahanuvā iii) niyam jeṭu, iv) ā kämiyā, v) pasak kämiyā, vi) veher leyā, vii) karaṇḍ leyā, and viii) karaṇḍ atsamu. These officials sometimes sat in session to administer the business of the monastery together with a group of monks who represented the 'two fraternities' (demuḷa) of the Abhayagiri monastery.[1]

The titles of the members of the committee perhaps reflect a clear definition of their individual functions. But one has to depend mainly on interpretations of these terms to form an idea about these functions as the inscription fails to provide any further information on the subject. The first term was translated by Wickremasinghe as 'the monk who looks after the nakā'.[2] Although nakā is derived from the Pali nikāya, it could, as Paranavitana pointed out,[3] carry the connotation of a 'monastery'.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll. A21-23.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.101.

[3] EZ Vol. III p.224 n.5.

L. S. Perera questioned Wickremashinghe's translation pointing out that this official was entitled to remuneration for his services. This, he maintained, 'is unlikely and unusual if he was a monk', and concluded that it is 'most likely that he was a layman'.[1]

The fact that this official was paid an allowance need not deter us from identifying him as a monk. For, according to the same inscription, monks who had mastered the canonical texts were also paid stipends in accordance with their attainments.[2] It may be pointed out that he alone among the members of the committee bears the title himiyan. Unlike the other officials, he did not hold a land allotment. The allowance in gold due to him was paid in two instalments at the 'sermons delivered at the inauguration and the prorogation of the period of "retreat" (vassa) for the monks'.[3] These facts show that there is little reason to contest Wickremasinghe's translation. Thus it appears that the chief monk of the monastery had a place in the committee of management, presumably in a supervisory capacity.

The significance of the second term, too, seems to have been largely misunderstood. The pirivahanuvā, who is the first lay official to be mentioned in the list of the members of the committee, was probably the premier lay official. But this term does not occur in the second part of the inscription which prescribes the payments to be made to each employee in return for his services. In this section, a certain pirivahanu vata

---

[1] L. S. Perera, Institutions of Ceylon from Inscriptions, p.1368.

[2] See p.213.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.94 ll.B1-2.

kämiyak occurs as an official who received an allotment of one kiri and two payas of land[1] - a meagre emolument compared with the five kiris granted to each of the last six members of the committee. Wickremasinghe believed that both these terms denoted the same official.[2] Paranavitana and Perera, who seem to have accepted this identification, have gone further to conclude that the niyam jeṭu, the third in order in the list of the member of the committee, was the chief administrative official.[3] It seems unlikely that one member of the committee should receive such a low stipend while all the other members received a higher and regular allowance. This prompts one to question the validity of Wickremasinghe's identification of pirivahanuvā with pirivahanuvata kämiyak.

The term pirivahanuvā occurs in its Sanskrit form - parivahana - in the ninth-century Sanskrit inscription found at a hemitage within the grounds of the Abhayagiri monastery.[4] In this record he is described as an official in charge of the protection of the 'inside and the outside'.[5] This term is not found in the Indian inscriptions and is not known in this form to Indian lexicographers. It is probably derived from the root vah connected with ūh, 'to carry' with the secondary meaning 'to lead' as in the term sārthavāha. The term is found in its verbal form in the phrase ma-(haveher piri)vahana mādabiyā in a tenth century inscription from nearby

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.94 l.B5; for kiri and paya, see p.66 n.3, 91 n.6.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.108 n.1.

[3] Paranavitana, Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II p.30 v.49; L. S. Perera, op.cit. pp. 1538, 1556.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.5 l.32.

[5] antarvahirakṣaṇakuśalasya. See p.165.

Abhayavāva; but the reading is doubtful.[1] This was not a title restricted to the monastic administration. A variant form - pirivahannā - occurs in the Badulla inscription to denote a village official. It was his duty to direct the committees of local administration in their tasks like inquiring into and levying fines on offences committed in the village.[2] In the Sanskrit inscription from Abhayagiri the parivahana was the official who received the higher emolument at the hermitage. It has been pointed out that even in the Mihintale Tablets he occurs at the head of the list of lay officials.

The relationship between the terms pirivahanuvā and pirivahanu vata kämi may be gleaned from an analogy in the Polonnaruva Rāja Māligāva inscription of Mahinda IV which speaks of a certain kuḍasalā vat kämi Mihindim who was in the service of the kuḍasalānāvan Ramuk.[3] It may be suggested on this basis that the pirivahanu vata kämiyak was a minor official subordinate to the pirivahanuvā.

The absence of any reference to the pirivahanuvā in the second part of the Mihintale record, if it was not the result of an omission on the part of the scribe, could be attributed to two possible causes. He could have been an honorary official. It is possible that a high-ranking dignitary or a member of the royal family occupied this important post. The Puḷiyankulam slab inscription gives an instance of a chief minister (maha ämati) being appointed to the stewardship of a hermitage.[4] Secondly, it

---

[1] AIC No. 111; the term mādabiyā occurs as an official title in the Sīgiri graffiti. See Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II vv.221, 391, 464, 470, 570.

[2] EZ Vol. V Pt. II pp. 194-195.

[3] EZ Vol. II p.54 ll.B12-16; for the rendering of the term varā, see EZ Vol. III p.108 n.3.

[4] See p.174

is also possible that this official was paid at a well-known rate so that it was not necessary to mention this fact. The parivahana at the hermitage attached to the Abhayagiri monstery was paid at the rate of one kiri of land for each village that the hermitage possessed - if he executed his duties in a satisfactory manner.[1] If the same principle was followed at the Cetiyagiri monastery, the emolument due to the pirivahanuvā would not have been fixed as it had to vary with the extent of the possessions of the monastery. Hence it seems reasonable to suggest that the pirivahanuvā or the parivahana was the chief administrative official at the monastery.

The next term - niyam jeṭu - was translated as 'the administrator of the market place' by Müller who believed that it was derived from nigama jyeṣṭha.[2] Wickremasinghe associated niyam with niyama (also nyāma) used in the sense of rules even in the Sanskrit inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery; he translated the term as 'administrator of rules'.[3] Among the graffiti at Sīgiri is a scribbling dated to the first half of the ninth century which mentions a niyam jeṭ who was an employee of the Budgamu monastery.[4] In another graffito niyam is used in the sense of 'rules'.[5] From this it seems more probable that Wickremasinghe's translation is correct. The larger monasteries which had to control extensive landed property including whole villages and even administer justice in these areas

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.32-33.

[2] AIC p. p.116.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.101 n.5

[4] Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II p.30 v.49.

[5] Ibid. p.261 v.423.

would have had to employ a person proficient in rules, regulations and laws to help them in this work.

Wickremasinghe traced the derivation of ā kämiyā to ādi kammika and translated it as 'principal workman'.[1] However ā is also the Sinhalese derivative from Pali aya and āya (Skt. āya) which means 'income'. In fact, in this inscription itself, it occurs in this sense in the combination ā-kala, 'receipt of income'.[2] Therefore, it seems more plausible to suggest that ā kämiyā was derived from āya karmī and to translate it as 'the collector of income'.[3]

The fifth term, pasak kämiyā, occurs in a graffito from Sīgiri dated to the second half of the eighth century.[4] Wickremasinghe translated it as 'almoner' believing that it was derived from paccaya kammika.[5] But the terms pas and pasak occur in the Mihintale inscription itself in the sense of records and accounts.[6] Pasak is most probably derived from Skt. pañjikā which occurs in the Abhayagiri inscription to denote the register in which the accounts and the records of administrative arrangements were entered.[7] It may be suggested that the pasak kämiyā was the accountant who was placed in charge of this register of the monastery.

The interpretation of the significance of the next three terms seems

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.101.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.94 l.A54

[3] SSS p.114.

[4] Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. I p.193 v.315.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.101.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.94 l.A54

[7] EZ Vol. I p. 5 l.32.

more difficult than that of the first five. The term leyā could denote either a scribe or an administrative official. The veher leyā was thus the scribe or some other administrative official attached to the monastery; his exact functions are not known. Karaṅḍ in karaṅḍleyā and karaṅḍ atsamu means 'casket'. It could refer to caskets of ceremonial significance used for keeping sacred relics; but it is more probable that in this case it connoted the casket in which the records and the gold of the monastery were stored. Later on, it is stated in the same inscription that the daily statements of accounts were to be kept in a locked casket (mundu karaṇḍu) which was to be sealed and kept in the 'relic shrine'.[1] The karaṅḍleyā and the karaṅḍ atsamu were, presumably, two officials in charge of this casket. The first term has been translated by Wickremasinghe as 'the registrar of caskets' and the second as 'the keeper of caskets'.[2]

It is evident from the second part of the Mihintale record that the nakā balana himiyan was paid a nāḷi of rice daily and an additional allowance of three kaḷand of gold a year. The last six officials of the committee received allotments of land to the extent of five kiri each. The niyam jeṭu received in addition a daily allowance of a nāḷi of rice and an annual grant of fifteen kaḷand of gold. The only other official to receive this allowance called setuvamaṭ mal mila was the maṅgul jeṭak[3] who was paid three kaḷand and two akas of gold a year. Wickremasinghe followed Müller and Gunasekara in translating this phrase as 'the cost of whitewashing and

[1] EZ Vol. I p.94 l.A53-60.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.101.

[3] See p.160.

flowers'.[1] It is clear from the context that this translation is unsatisfactory and inappropriate. However, it is not possible to establish the exact significance of the term at the present state of our knowledge. In all, the payments made to the committee amounted to thirty kiri of land, about four amunas and two pälas of rice and eighteen kalanda of gold, not including the payments, if any, made to thepirivahanuvā.[2]

As in South Indian temples, the most important duty of the committee of management was the supervision of the fiscal administration. The Mihintale Tablets prescribe that the committee should attend to the duties connected with receipts and disbursements, 'both inside and outside'.[3] All receipts from the land and the villages which had not been given over to the employees were entered in the paspot. Similarly, all payments made daily for the supply of meals, for repairs and to those who were entitled to allowances were written down in the same register.[4] The paspot is probably the same as the pañjikā referred to in the Sanskrit inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery. It is laid down in this record that on the appointment of an official, his name and the nature of his duties were to be written down in the pañjikā.[5] According to I-tsing, the Buddhist monasteries of North India maintained registers of the names of the resident

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 107, 108.

[2] For explanations of these weights and measures, see pp. 66 n.3, 91 n.6, 95.

[3] See p. 156.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.94 ll.A53-56.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.27-29, 30-31.

monks.[1]

The committee of management prepared a daily statement of accounts from the entries in these registers and this was duly signed and placed in a locked casket.[2] The committee had a seal of its own. The casket was stamped with this seal and placed in the 'relic shrine'.[3] It is important that this was an administrative procedure which had to be attended to daily; from this it is clear that the committee of management was a permanent body of officials which had to meet regularly every day. Most probably, the pasak kāmiyā was the official who was directly concerned with this work. The care and attention devoted to the details of the administration of finances is another noteworthy feature evident in these regulations. Owing to the efficacy of this system, the committee of management had knowledge of the day-to-day state of finances and was therefore in a position to exert full control over financial matters and to lessen chances of misappropriation.

---

[1] I-tsing p.65.

[2] davas patā viyavūtāk paspotḷi liyavā kamtān samāṅgin atvatu karāy san otamanvun sanin paṭavay mundu karaṅduyehi taba. EZ Vol. I p.94 ll.A55-67. The phrase san otamanavun sanin paṭavay was translated by Wickremasinghe as 'such entries as are found false shall be expunged from the accounts'. He followed Clough's interpretation of ota as 'falsehood' and Jayatilaka's translation of paṭavay as having caused to disappear. Ot and ota occur in the Dhampiyā Aṭuva Gāṭapadaya and Muvadevdā in the sense of 'to place' and 'to deposit'. Paṭavanu andpaṭvay are known to occur with the meanings of 'to fill', 'to load' and 'to maintain'. San has the meaning of 'sign' and 'name'. Hence the translation of the passage as given above seems to be the most appropriate. DAG p.14; Muyadevdā vv. 56, 85.

[3] No seals which can be definitely identified as those belonging to monasteries have been found so far in Ceylon. But many seals of this nature have been recovered from monastic sites in North India, viz. Nālandā, Kasia and Paharpūr. Ghosh, Guide to Nālandā pl.x; Dikshit,'Paharpūr Excavations' MASI No. 55 pl. lix; ARASI 1905-6 p.58.

At the end of every month, a monthly statement of accounts was prepared from the daily statements; and at the end of each year, the twelve monthly statements were used to prepare the annual statement of accounts which was presented to the assembly of monks.[1] Individual monks who enjoyed property belonging to the monastery were also required to show their accounts.[2] Probably these as well as the accounts of hermitages attached to the monastery went into the annual statement. The inscriptions at the Abhaygiri monastery specifically state that, each year, the officials of the monastery were to place before the monks the annual statement of income, expenditure and payments made to the employees of the establishments attached to the nikāya viz. the Naka...vihāra, Mahasala piḷimage (the shrine of the stone image), Ruvanpahā, Abayaturā mahasā, ... boge (the shrine of the bo-tree), Batge (refectory), Sāgiri and Näṭägiri.[3]

Further evidence on the annual settlement of accounts is available in an inscription from Kaludiyapokuṇa which directs the officials of the monastery to submit their accounts before the eighth day of the waning moon of the month of Vap (Skt. Aśvina, October/November).[4] Paranavitana has pointed out that the Dīpavāli, the day on which the Hindu merchants settle their annual accounts, follows seven days after this - on the amāvasya day of the same month. He has suggested the possibility that the

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.94 ll.A56-58.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.91 ll.A15-16; see also p.115.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.236 ll.44-49.

[4] väpä aṭavakin membe lekam nokoṭ divel noganna isā. EZ Vol. III p.265 ll.37-38.

monastery, too, in accordance with this Indian tradition, would have closed its accounts seven days earlier to facilitate the preparation of the annual statement in time for submission to the assembly of monks on this day.[1] It is probably this session of the committee of the Mihintale monastery which saw to the preparation of the annual statement of accounts that the representatives of the two mulas of the Abhayagiri monastery attended. Records from both Mihintale and Kaludiyapokuṇa also state that the officials who failed to submit their accounts forfeited their rights to employment as well as to their maintenance land.[2]

The duties of the committee of management at the Hindu temples of South India, though they comprised mainly the supervision of income and expenditure, were not restricted to this. It was they who purchased land, dealt with boundary disputes and conducted festivals and feasts to Brāhmaṇas.[3] In Ceylon, little information is available on this point. It is possible that appointments to lesser posts were made by the committee. For, according to the Mihintale Tablets, it was the committee which accepted and approved the sureties and guarantors that these employees had to provide to ensure re-imbursement of any loss that might be incurred by them.[4] Further, according to a pillar inscription from Mihintale read by Müller, the committee seems to have levied fines on those who felled trees

[1] EZ Vol. III p.268.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.94 l.A58; Vol. III p.265 ll.37-38.

[3] MRE Nos. 327 of 1916, 393 of 1929/30, 38 of 1931/2, 113 of 1938/9.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll.A23-24.

without permission.[1] The committee held its sessions at the 'inner monastery'; it had a junior scribe (le daru) attached to it possibly to attend to the clerical work arising from its proceedings.[2]

This system of administering monasteries through committees of management is strongly reminiscent of the administrative organization of the Hindu temples of South India. On considering various factors like the close relationship which prevailed between South India and Ceylon, the similarity of the administrative problems that these religious institutions would have had to face and the similarity of even some of the administrative arrangements, it is very tempting to suppose a common origin for the committee system. Unfortunately, apart from references to treasurers and accountants, no detailed list of the officials who constituted the committees of management is available in any of the many relevant South Indian inscriptions. Hence, a comparison of the administrative institutions of the temples of South India and of the monasteries of Ceylon yields little information more specific than their obvious basic similarity.

On the other hand, titles of certain officials of the kamtän, the committee of management of the Cetiyagiri monastery, like the pirivahanuvā and the niyam jeṭu are known to occur in the records of the ninth century; pasak kämiyā occurs in an inscription of the eighth century. Titles of lesser officials like the veher atsama can be traced back as far even as the fifth century.[3] The term pirivahanuvā was known even in the field of

[1] AIC No. 115.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 96-97 ll.B43-44.

[3] See EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 111-119.

secular administration. In an inscription of a king entitled Sirisangbo Mapurpmukā, mē pirivahannaku and käbili pirivahannā are mentioned among the officials engaged in the administration of a district (raṭa).[1] The incidence of this term in the Badulla inscription has already been cited.

The word kamtän itself occurs in the sense of a government institution in the term deruvanadekamtän.[2] ..... It is also relevant that committees composed of eight members each were known in local administration. The Badulla inscription cited above mentions two groups called the gamhi aṭadenā 'eight of the village', and the adaviye aṭadenā, 'eight of the forest tracts these committees which remind one of the grāmāṣṭakulas mentioned in inscriptions in Bengal seem to have been under the supervisory control of the pirivahannā.[3] These facts tend to suggest that the committee system of administration which was known at the Cetiyagiri monastery represents the result of a fairly long process of evolution in association with, and perhaps under the influence of the local institutions of secular administration.

It is not certain whether the committee system was current at the other monasteries, too. The office of parivahana was known at a hermitage attached to the Abhayagiri monastery.[4] A graffito from Sīgiri refers to the niyam jeṭ of a hermitage called Budgamu-vehera which, presumably, was in the Matale district in the central highlands.[5] It does not necessarily

[1] AIC No. 114.

[2] See EZ Vol. II pp. 24, 31, 37, 47.

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. II pp. 194-195.

[4] See p.165.

[5] Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II p. 30 v.49; JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.111.

follow that the committee system as such was known at these monasteries. But if indeed this system was the result of a long process of evolution there is no reason to presume that it was restricted to one monastery. In this context, it is also interesting that the Cūlavaṃsa mentions that king Māna appointed seven paṭihāras to serve under the monk to whom he donated the Uttaromūḷa monastery.[1] Normally, the term pratihāra occurs in Sanskrit literature in the sense of door-keeper. But Geiger has drawn attention to the possibility of a connection with the seven lay officials of the kamtän mentioned above.[2] If this is accepted, it would imply that this system was known also at the Uttaromūḷa of the Abhayagiri monastery.

Following the reference to the members of the committee is a list of officials of a lower rank. Two of the officials who received the highest emolument in this second category were the pirivahanu vata kämiyak and the piṭassamak, each of whom received one kiri and two payas of land and a daily allowance of two aḍmanās of rice.[3] The first, as suggested earlier, was most probably an official subordinate to the pirivahanuvā.

The second term piṭassamak has been translated as 'one who throws away dead flowers' and 'scavenger' by Müller and Gunasekara respectively.[4] But on account of the context in which this term is found and the emolument the official received, it is rather unlikely that he was an employee of a minor capacity. The term was not restricted to monastic usage. It occurs

[1] Cv., 57.20-21.

[2] Cv., trsl. Pt. I p.194 n 2; CCMT p.195.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 94-95 ll. B5, 9.

[4] AIC p. 118; EZ Vol. I p.108 n.9.

together with kulassam after two other officials, an administrator of a territorial division (bim lad) and an agricultural official (vel bädi) in an inscription from Vīraṅdagoḍa dated to a period 'between the beginning of the eighth and the middle of the ninth century'.[1] These two terms and their variant forms piṭatsam and kulatsam find mention also in the Vihāregama and the Polonnaruva Council Chamber inscriptions of the tenth century, as designations of royal officials.[2]

The ending assam and its variant atsam are found in a number of terms in the Mihintale Tablets e.g. kamassam, dummalassam, karaṅḍ atsam, dāge atsam and vehera atsam. The last occurs in its earlier form vahara atasama in the Hiṅguregala inscription.[3] Paranavitana suggested the derivation of at from artha meaning 'substance', 'wealth' and 'property' and samu from samudga which means 'box' or casket'. He defined atasama as 'a functionary entrusted with the box or casket in which the valuables belonging to the monastery were kept'.[4] But such a derivatinn seems unlikely as atsamu occur in connectinn with karaṅḍu which, too, means 'a casket'. Paranavitana has also suggested an alternative derivation from arthasvāmin which would yield the translation 'purser'.[5]

Ostensibly, there is some evidence which supports this interpretation. The vahara atasama of the Hiṅguregala inscription was one of the officials

[1] EZ Vol. V Pt. I p.123 ll.1-3.

[2] EZ Vol. IV p.53 ll.A10-12; p.41 ll.A10-13.

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp.119-124 ll. 2, 6, 9, 13.

[4] EZ Vol. V Pt. I p.118 n.6.

[5] Ibid.

who paid out the money belonging to the saṅgha to make a purchase in the name of the monastery.[1] Similarly, the context of the occurrence of veher atsam in the Mihintale Tablets suggests that he was an official attached to the store-house of the monastery.[2] It has been mentioned before that the karaṇḍ atsama was possibly the official in charge of the casket in which the records of accounts as well as perhaps the valuables of the monastery were kept.

On the other hand, not all the officials bearing the title atsam seem to have performed functions connected with the handling of money. The dummalassam were minor employees responsible most probably for the provision of incense (dum) and flowers (mal) to the relic shrines and the image houses.[3] Hence the rendering of atsam as 'purser' does not seem to be acceptable.

It may be suggested that the term was derived from artha and śram, 'to exert' or 'to toil', and that, like arthasādhaka, it denoted an official 'who exerted himself for the success of' a given cause. It is seen that atsam always occurs in conjunction with another word like piṭa, veher, dāge or karaṇḍ. If so, the literal meaning of the term piṭassamak would approximate to the translation given by Wickremasinghe, viz. 'one who arranges outside affairs'.[4]

---

[1] See p.154 n.3 supra.

[2] See p.159.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B34, 38.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.108.

It has already been mentioned that the Sanskrit inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery speaks of the 'protection of the inside and the outside'[1] Similarly, while referring to the management of finance, the Mihintale Tablets, too, draw a distinction between 'inside' and 'outside'.[2] Though the exact significance of these terms is not clear, it seems likely that a distinction was made between the day-to-day administration of the main monastery and such affairs as the management of property lying outside the immediate vicinity of the monastery. The latter, one may postulate would have fallen within the duties of the piṭassamak.

The only other official to get the same emolument as the piṭassamak was the rajge upäni kämiyak. There is little doubt that rajge here meant 'the palace or in a secondary sense 'the government'. Müller translated the title as 'a workman born in the grounds of the king' and Gunasekara as 'a workman in the king's house'.[3] Upä occurs in Sinhalese literature in the sense of 'birth' as well as 'rise', 'ascent' and 'upsurge';[4] upäni may have meant 'that which has arisen'. On this basis, the translation of Wickremasinghe as the official who 'attends to matters arising in (connexion with) the royal house' appears to be the most acceptable.[5]

The possession of land and the control that the monastery came to wield over its tenants would have given rise to many occasions of contact

---

[1] See p.142.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.922 ll. A22-23.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.108 n.10.

[4] Amāvatura (Sorata) 1948, p.145; Mahābodhivaṁśa Gaṇṭhipada Vivaranaya (Dharmarama,1910) p.92.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.108.

with royal officials, While discussing the disadvantages of living at a large monastery, the Sāratthadīpanī points out that a monk living there may have to constantly visit the palace or the residences of the ministers to attend to various matters.[1] A ninth-century inscription forbids monks to send betel leaves or other presents to the royal household for the sake of gain.[2] At Cetiyagiri, a special official seems to have been appointed to attend to all such affairs.

A corresponding term which occurs in a later part of the Mihintale Tablets is saṅgväli upāni kämiyak. 'the employee who attends to matters arising in the saṅgväla'. He was allotted a kiri of land and a daily allowance of one admanā of rice.[3] Väla (Skt. āvalī) may mean 'a collection'. Saṅgväla, therefore would mean 'a group of monks'. The related term saṅgvälla occurs in a tenth-century inscription which refers to the Vīraṅkura-arama belonging to the saṅgvälla of the Mulasoveher.[4] The first seems to have been a hermitage which came under the second - a larger monastery. Thus, on the analogy of the rajge upāni kämiya, it may be suggested that the saṅgväli upāni kämiyak was an official who attended to matters arising from relations with the hermitages attached to the Cetiyagiri monastery. Though seemingly an appropriate explanation, it is difficult to rely on it as the Mihintale Tablets also refer to certain dues (gekulī) received from

---

[1] Sāratthadīpanī p. 562.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.4 l.13.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.95 l. B21.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.25 ll. 11-13.

the saṅgvälla.[1] It has been suggested on this basis that saṅgvälla denoted land. Secondly, this official occurs among the employees attached to the refectory, and hence, Perera has suggested that he, too, was an employee attached to the refectory.[2]

With the growth of monastic property, the treasury became an essential feature in the organizatinn of a monastery. In the fifth century, Fa-Hian mentions the treasury of the Abhayagiri monastery, which contained 'numerous gems and a mani jewel of inestimable value'.[3] It was suggested earlier that the valuables belonging to the Cetiyagiri monastery would have been kept in a locked casket called the mundu karaṅdu.[4] In addition to this, the monastery had to maintain a constant and extensive supply of grain for the provision of food to the monks and for the payment of the daily allowances. It was stipulated in the Mihintale Tablets that three officials had to be present, without fail, at the pay office and at the place where the raw rice was distributed.[5] These were probably members of the committee of management rather than lesser officials. They would have supervised the distribution of grain from the store-house (koṭa) by the officials attached to it.

At the Cetiyagiri monastery, the employee most directly connected with this establishment was the koṭarākināvak, the head caretaker of the store-

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll. A 39.

[2] L. S. Perera, Institutions.... p.1540.

[3] Beal, op.cit. p.47.

[4] See p.146.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll. A26-29; see also p. 209.

house. He received two pā of land and a daily allowance of one admanā and two pat of rice. He had an assistant - the koṭa rākiyak who received the same amount of land but only one admanā of rice a day. Most probably, the two veher atsam who occur along with these officials also were attached to the store-house. It was pointed out earlier that they were connected with the finances of the monastery as early as in the fifth century.[1] They were allotted the same amount of land in addition to a daily allowance of one admanā and one pat of rice. The four employees called vaṭnāvāri who occur in the same section of the inscription are described as 'goldsmiths' in Müller's translation.[2] This translation finds no justification. Gunasekara translated the phrase as 'four energetic paymasters' and Wickremasinghe as 'servants of the paymaster'.[3] It is also possible to render it into English as 'employees who served in turn as paymasters'.[4] Their emolument amounted to two pā of land and a daily allowance of one admanā of rice each. One may surmise that all these employees were under the control of the ākāmiyā and through him of the committee of management.

Apart from these administrative officials, there were certain officials who seem to have been concerned with the organization of the ceremonial and

---

[1] See p.154.

[2] AIC p.118.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.109 and n.3.

[4] For a discussion on vāri, see p.187. Vaṭ could mean both 'pay' and 'food'. But it is seen that in an earlier context vaṭ ōnā tāna occurs together with and therefore is different from sahal gannā tāna and batsāhana tāna. Hence it is reasonable to assume that in both these contexts, vaṭ meant 'pay' and not 'food'.

the ritualistic aspect of monastic life. The foremost of these was the maṅgul jeṭak who was allowed a kiri of land, one vasag[1] and an additional allowance of three kalaṇd and two akas of gold a year.[2] The Mihintale Tablets speak of festivals (maṅgul) held in honour of various sacred objects at the monastery and the maṅgul jeṭak may have been the official in charge of their organization.

Immediately after this, mention is made of a certain vatsikā kämiyak who received a kiri of land and a vasag.[3] Müller gave the translation 'one who prepares medicine' without adducing reasons for his interpretation. Gunasekara's translation as 'a servant of one year', too, is hardly suitable.[4] Wickremasinghe has translated vatsikā kämiyak as 'a cowherd'.[5] Vatsikā in Sanskrit does mean 'a calf' but vatsikā kämiyak or anything equivalent is unknown to both Sanskrit and Sinhalese usage as the term for a cowherd. The context of its occurrence, too, suggests that he performed some ceremonial function. Vat can be derived from Skt. vrata and sikā from śikṣā and the vatsikā kämiyak could, therefore, also have been an official connected with religious observances holding an office similar to that of the upadhivārika of the Mūla Sarvāstivāda Vinaya,[6] who

---

[1] For vasag, see pp.213-215.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.94 ll. B6-7.

[3] Ibid. ll. B7-8.

[4] AIC p.118; EZ Vol. I p.108 n.1.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.108.

[6] See Edgerton, op.cit. Vol. II p.136.

announced the dates on which the monks had to practise religious observances.

An official called ol kämiyak who received two payas of land and one admanā and two pat of rice as a daily allowance seems to have been another employee who falls into the same category. Müller and Gunasekara translated the term as 'masker'.[1] Sorata has suggested the rendering 'maker of headdresses'.[2] A graffito from Sīgiri, dated to the second half of the eighth century, records a verse composed by threemen who described themselves as the assistants or the apprentices (ataväsi) of the olkamuna of the Dunaturā-nā-vehera.[3] Paranavitana believed that the olkamuna would have been a master-craftsman like a sculptor as he had 'apprentices'.[4] But if the olkämi in the Mihintale Tablets was a craftsman, it is more likely that he would have been listed in that section of the inscription which deals with the payments made to various craftsmen like carpenters, stoneworkers and blacksmiths. Secondly, the title kämi (karmī) also suggests that he was more probably an official. Olkämi can be compared with puda olakkam which occurs in the Daḷadāsirita in the sense of ritual pertaining to the worship of sacred objects;[5] if they were indeed related

[1] EZ Vol. I p.108 n.11.

[2] SSS p.198.

[3] Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II p.233 v. 375.

[4] Ibid. pp. 233 n.4.

[5] Daḷdāsirita (Sorata, 1955) p.51.

the olkämi would have been a functionary who supervised the performance of daily ritual.

In his study of the Tirupati temple, B. Stein pointed out that the expansion of the temple led to the rise of new subsidiary institutions with separate endowments and administrative arrangements with a certain degree of autonomy.[1] We have already noted in a previous chapter that signs of a similar development are evident in the tendency to make land-grants to a particular institution within the monastery rather than to the monastery as a whole. Additional evidence is found in the Mihintale Tablets which refer to the prevalence of institutions like the 'relic shrine' (dāge) and the 'image house' (pilimage) with separate endowments and officials as distinct from those of the main institution.

The 'relic shrine' owned a village called Kaṇḍāgama and another village, Guṭāgama, belonged to the 'image house'.[2] Six officials are listed in the service of the first, namely dāge atsamak, ganajeṭu, karaṇḍle and three who bore the title varjeṭu. It is noteworthy that the first and the third bear titles similar to those of the committee of management. The dāge atsamak would have been the official in charge of the shrine; the other would have been vested with the charge of the relic casket or the casket of valuables, if not both. Gunasekara suggested that the ganajeṭu was the chief of a chapter of monks - a very unlikely supposition.[3] Müller

---

[1] B. Stein, 'The economic functions of a mediaeval South Indian temple', Jnl. As. Stud. Vol. 19, 1959-60 pp. 163-177.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 75-113 ll.A37-38, B34-39.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.110 n.5.

took it to mean 'the overseer of tenantry'.[1] Wickremasinghe's translation, 'the chief of the retinue of attendants', seems to be the most appropriate as the term gaṇanāyaka is also used, at times, in this meaning.[2] As to the last term, Wickremasinghe's translation as 'superintendants of service by turns' is quite acceptable as this institution seems to have depended to a great extent on this form of labour.[3] All these six officials received, presumably, the taxes from the Karandāgama, for their services.

At least two officials were employed at the shrine of the stone image. Each of these - the puṇākämiyak and the kamassamak - received a grant of two pā of land and a daily allowance of one admanā and two pats of rice.[4] The first term is obscure.[5] The kamassamak would have been the functionary who attended to the administrative affairs relating to the image house. The monastery also employed two officials, the piyangal pereväliyak and pavu-pereväliyak, each of whom received two pā of land and one vasag;[6] their functions are not clear.

The preceding examination of the titles of the employees of the Cetiyagiri monastery reveals that this institution engaged a body of officials headed by a committee to carry out the administrative functions involved in the management of its affairs. It is true that the saṅgha as a whole, through

[1] AIC p.119.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.110.

[3] See p.167

[4] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll. B41-42.

[5] Wickremasinghe believed that puṇā is the same as puṇā which is a ceremonial vessel used in shrines for pouring water and considered to be so important witnesses in litigation were sworn on it. EZ Vol. I p. lll n.7.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.95 ll. B11-12.

its assembly, wielded some influence over the administration. But it is noteworthy that only one monk from the monastery - the nakā balana himiyan - is mentioned as having entered into direct participation in the actual administration. Such a system would have met the need to protect the individual monk from involvement in activities proscribed in the Vinaya rules.

It is perhaps the information available on the Cetiyagiri monastery which has given rise to the belief prevalent among certain scholars that the administration of monasteries in Ceylon was confined to the lay officials.[1] Such a conclusion, however, would not accord with what little is known about the administrative organization of the Abhayagiri monastery. As at the Cetiyagiri monastery, a large body of laymen seem to have been employed in the administration of the Abhayagiri monastery. Of these, the parivahana, for one, was an official common to both. But it becomes clearly evident from the records of the Abhayagiri monastery that its residents, unlike the monks of the Cetiyagiri monastery, played a very important role in the administrative affairs of their monastery.

The ninth-century Sanskrit inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery mentions certain functionaries called pañjikāsthaviras, 'the senior monks who maintained the registers of the monastery'. It is further laid down that, on granting maintenance lands to an official who superintends workmen (kāraka), his work was to be examined and the nature of his duties was to be

[1] See p. 174.

written down in the register.[1] It would thus appear that certain administrative duties carried out by a lay official at the Cetiyagiri monastery had been, at the Abhayagiri monastery, transferred to members of the saṅgha. They seem to have possessed some control over the appointment of lay officials. The inscription adds that the salary paid to the parivahana varied according to the efficiency he showed in the execution of his duties.[2] Presumably, it was the monks who exercised their discretion in the regulation of wages implicit in this statement. This inference gains additional support from the Kaludiyapokuṇa inscription which decrees that those monks who, without justification, deprive monastic employees of their maintenance lands or of their wages, forfeited their right to live at the monastery.[3] It is clear from this that the monks at these monasteries were in a position to restrict or control the emoluments paid to their employees and that there were occasions when they exercised their authority without prudence.

Further, the Sanskrit inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery directs the monks living in the hermitages at Lahasikā, Hunāla and Sunagrāma to collect the income from the villages belonging to these hermitages and to make the officials (karmī) and the accountants (gaṇaka) submit, at the end of each year, a statement of income, expenditure and balance in hand for perusal by the monks nominated for the purpose by the saṅgha, presumably of the main monastery. If any dishonesty was detected, the offender was to be

[1] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.27-29, 30-31.

[2] Parivahanasyāpi antarvahiśca rakṣaṇakuśalasya padālām varjampratyekam pratigrāmaṃ kirikiṛkṣetraṃ dātavyaṃ samarthsya nānyasya. EZ Vol. I p. 5 ll.32-33.

[3] nokam bäḷa dasnaṭ nimi divel valahana vethimiyanud. EZ Vol. III p.265, ll.30-32.

made to restore the property in question. Disputes were to be inquired into by the senior monks who kept the register.[1] It would appear that the monks living at the hermitages were held responsible to the main monastery for the supervision of their administrative arrangements. At the main monastery the senior monks who kept the registers and representatives nominated by the assembly of monks carried out certain administrative functions in controlling the hermitages attached to the monastery by auditing their accounts and inquiring into their disputes. Another instance of monks performing the former task is found in the Mihintale Tablets. It was the monks and not the lay officials who represented the two mulas.[2] of the Abhayagiri monastery at the meeting of the committee of management of the Cetiyagiri monastery when the statement of accounts was prepared.[3] At the end of each year, they forwarded it to the general assembly of monks of the Abhayagiri monastery for their approval.[4] They helped the main monastery to keep a close check on the constituents of the nikāya. The monks of the two mulas and the six avasas were responsible for the administration of the main institutions within the Abhayagiri monastery, too. According to a tenth-century inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery, the accounts of the image-house,

---

[1] varṣaparisamāptau tatra tatra samastamāyam vyayam śeṣañca karmibhirgana-kaisca saṅghanuñateṣu bhikṣupadarśya.... pañjikasthavirairevа padalayika nirupaṇoya. See EZ Vol. I p.4 ll.3-10.

[2] See p.193.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll. A.20-23.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll. 37-38.

the dāgāba, the shrine of the bo-tree, Ruvanpahā and Sāgiri were to be obtained from these monks and presented at the end of each year to the general assembly of monks.[1]

The regulations laid down in the inscription of Kassapa V provide further clarification of the role of monks in monastic administration. According to this record, the piriven laddan of the Maha Kapārā Pirivena were allotted one amuna of rice and four akas of gold a day for the provisio of food and one thousand (kalanda) of gold at the end of each year for the provision of robes.[2] Wickremasinghe has translated the term piriven laddan by 'recipients of cells'.[3] Piriven which originally meant a 'cell' had come, by this time, to mean one of the 'colleges' of monks living in a monastery.[4] In a later passage, piriven laddan occurs in a context which suggests that the term denoted a special category of monks and not mere recipients of cells.[5] The same record directs them to use all the income, apart from what had been personally allocated to them, to make the payments due to monks and employees, to pay for repairs and religious paintings and to use the remainder to purchase land.[6] This reveals that the piriven laddan enjoyed personal incomes and held responsible positions in the administration of the finances of the piriven.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll. 35-38.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.48-50.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.57.

[4] See Infra p. and Sāratthadīpanī p.510.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.49 l.54.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.52-54; see also p.106.

It is not stated whether the piriven laddan were laymen or monks. However, the same inscription refers to a class of monks called avas laduvan.[1] Avas, another term for a 'residence', is, as Perera has shown,[2] at times interchangeable with piriven. Thus it is possible to suggest, on this analogy, that piriven laddan, too, were monks.

In this context, it seems relevant to examine another statement in the same inscription, which deals with the organization of the administration of the monastery. It runs as follows: abhiyukta batī himisuran pere sirit se vaṭanu isā.[3] Wickremasinghe suggested vat as the alternative reading for the second word. Vaṭhimisuran would be senior monks. But it is fairly clear from the photograph of the estampage that the first letter is ba and not va. In this context, batī, if derived from bhṛta, as Sorata has suggested,[4] could mean 'supported', 'hired' and 'maintained'. Vaṭa in vaṭanu could mean 'pay', 'food' or 'behave'. The most satisfactory of the different translations of this passage seems to be: 'The senior monks engaged on pay should be paid according to former custom'.[5] This would support the suggestion made earlierthat monks were employed in the administration of the Abhayagiri monastery and that they received remuneration for their services. This does not mean that all the administrative function

[1] EZ Vol. I p.48 l.29.

[2] L. S. Perera op.cit. p.1216.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.48 l.54.

[4] SSS p.634.

[5] Cf. Wickremasinghe's translation: 'The appointed monks of religious ceremonies shall act according to former custom'. EZ Vol. I p.57.

were performed by monks; they had the assistance of lay officials. But the responsibility for the management of monastic residences lay primarily in their hands.

The procedure followed in respect of the accounts of the income and expenditure of the main institutions other than the residences at the Abhayagiri monastery was referred to in an earlier context. The inscription of Kassapa V provides information on the keeping of accounts at the parivenas of the Maha Kapārā Perivena. According to this text, the monks, together with the piriven laddan, appointed a committee of eight members to obtain the accounts of the parivenas and to prepare the statement presented to the general assembly of monks at the end of the year. This committee was to be composed of four apilisarana monks and four gorokun.[1]

Wickremasinghe's translation of the two terms as 'destitute' and 'decrepit' persons is obviously wrong. In the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, the Pali term garukā is translated as gorok koṭa ätiyahu[2] and the Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya renders garukato as gorok karana ladde.[3] On this basis, gorokun would mean those who were respected and honoured. Further, in the Ruvanmal nighaṇḍuva, gorok is used as s synonym for ädur and guru[4] while in the Vinayārthasamuccaya, the term aṭuvā gorokun vahanse is used in the sense

[1] Pirivenladdan saṅgun sämäṅgin dakvā dun apilisarana satar deneku hā gorokun satar deneku ätuḷväḍeCasanin aṭdeneku piriven illa havurudu nimiyatä lekam koṭ mahasaṅgä asvanu isa. EZ Vol. I p.49 ll. 54-56.

[2] DAG p.256.

[3] JAG p. 135.

[4] Ruvanmalnighaṇḍu (DP de Alwis Wijesekara,1914) p.118.

of aṭṭhakathācariya.[1] From this it appears that gorok was used in the sense of 'teacher'. Hence gorokun would be the senior monks who taught the dhamma and held positions of honour.

In an earlier section of the inscription under consideration, apilisaraṇa vathimiyan were contradistinguished from lābhaladuvan and avasladuvan.[2] It is evident from this that the apilisaraṇa monks were distinct from those who were entitled to an income and those who held office at a monastic residence. On considering this and the fact that they were contrasted with gorokun, one may reasonably assume that the apilisaraṇa saṅgun were the junior monks who neither held high office as administrators and teachers nor were favoured with honours and stipends. It is not clear how they came to bear the appellation apilisaraṇa, which means 'without protection' or 'without refuge'.

In this connection it is noteworthy that the Buddhist monk became a fully-fledged member of the saṅgha only after a period of probation (nissaya) spent under the supervision of a senior monk. Normally, this lasted five years from the time of his Ordination. After the completion of this period he was called a nissayasamucchanaka and could live independently.[3] The term nissaya also means 'protection' and 'help'. Its Sinhalese equivalent nisa has been used in this sense in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya.[4] It is

[1] Vinayārthasamuccaya quoted by Vimalakitti, see DAG p.330.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.29-30.

[3] See p.199.

[4] DAG p.67.

therefore, quite possible that nisa and pilisarana were interchangeable and that the term apilisarana saṅgun was used to denote those monks who had completed their period of probatinn and had been released from the 'protection' of their teachers. It is thus clear that the junior and the senior members of the saṅgha, or in other words the official and the non-official elements of the saṅgha, were equally represented in the committee which prepared the annual statement of accounts for submission to the members of the general assembly.

The practice of referring a difficult disciplinary problem to a committee (ubbāhikā) nominated by the general assembly of monks was recommended in the Cullavagga as a means of saving time and of avoiding the tedium of detailed open discussion. The decision of the committee was considered by the general assembly.[1] The Cullavagga also cites an actual instance when this method was used. An attempt was made to resolve the differences over the ten points of discipline which led to the Second Council by appointing a committee of eight monks, composed of four representing the East and four representing the Pāṭheyya faction, to inquire into it.[2] The similarity between this and the committee at the Mahā Kapārā Pirivena in points of numbers, representation and functions strongly suggests a close connection between the two and possibly the derivation of the latter from the former. If this possibility is accepted, it would seem that institutions which were originally used for the solution of disciplinary

---

[1] Vinaya Piṭaka Vol. II pp. 95-97.

[2] Ibid. pp. 305-306.

problems were, in a later time, adapted to meet the needs that arose with the growth of monastic property.

The ownership of all monastic property, whether held by individuals or by institutions, was, in theory, vested in the whole body of monks. As such, the general assembly of monks had a supervisory control over the administration. The annual assembly which scrutinized the accounts would have given the monks an opportunity to exercise this controlling authority. The keen, perhaps too lively, interest they evinced in the proceedings of this meeting is clearly evident in the provision made in the inscription of Kassapa V cited earlier for intervention by royal officials to mediate and settle any disputes which may arise during the proceedings.[1]

At Mihintale, it was perhaps the committee of management which appointed the lesser officials. But monks seem to have had some control over the appointment of at least the senior officials. The Mihintale Tablets prohibit monks from giving positions of controlling authority over places belonging to the 'inner monastery' (ätvehera) to their relatives and adds that all relatives of monks appointed to office at the monastery were to be dismissed.[2] The assembly of monks certainly had controlling powers over the officials. For it is specifically stated in the same inscriptinn that officials were to be instructed or reproached only by monks in assembly and not by individual monks.[3] In addition to this, the nakã balana himiyan woul

[1] EZ Vol. I p.237 ll.50-51.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll.A18-19, A24-25. See also p.238.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 91-92 ll.A16-17.

have served as a link between the officials and the assembly of monks. His presence in the committee of management should have facilitated the control of the administration in accordance with wishes of the assembly. One may surmise that the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery would have wielded greater control over the administration through their participation in it as 'keepers of the register' and as the members of the committees which scrutinized the accounts.

It is difficult to imagine that all the monks of a large monastery like the Abhayagiri could meet at one place. I-tsing noticed that at Nālandā, monks congregated in separate assemblies as the numbers were too large.[1] One can envisage the prevalence of a similar system at the larger monasteries of Ceylon, too. The result would have been the transfer of authority to institutions like the mūla and avasa. In fact, the evidence from the inscriptions seems to agree with such an inference. The authority over the main shrines and hermitages attached to the Abhayagiri monastery was vested in these bodies.

The Abhayagiri and the Cetiyagiri monasteries represent two different types in the extent of the influence that the saṅgha wielded in the administrative affairs of each monastery. But in both its influence was considerable. On the other hand, the Puliyankulama inscription provides an instance when the power of the saṅgha was reduced to a minimum.[2] According to this record, Udā Mahayā, the heir-apparent under Dappula IV, built the

[1] I-tsing pp. 154-55.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 182-191.

Udā Kitagbopavu hermitage, made endowments for its maintenance and appointed a high dignitary – Sakmaha-āmati Saṅgalnāvan to the position of its steward. It is by this appointment that the influence of the monks was curbed. The position of the steward was not only to be held by the descendants of Sangalnāvan by hereditary right but also any opposition caused by royal officials or the saṅgha against them was to be settled by the thousand retainers of the heir-apparent. Further, if there be any dispute caused by the clergy or laymen on the conditions laid down in the record, the thousand retainers were to settle it for the officials of the hermitage, without resort to arms. If they fail in this task, they were to seek the help of the retainers of the palace. This is the first known instance of provision being made for intervention by soldiers in case of a disturbance within a monastery. As a result, the steward was elevated to the position of importance and independence from the monks as well as from the state officials.

It would have been clear from this discussion that it is extremely difficult to discuss the administration of a monastery in a general sense. The remark of Gernet[1] that the responsibility of administering the monaster was confined to the lay officials and the directly opposite view held by Rahula that 'the administration of a monastery was entirely in the hands of

[1] 'Finalement, c'est le principe de la gestion directe de leur biens par les religieux et par les communautés qui a prévalu, non pas dans les parties du monde bouddhique, puisque, de nos jours encore, a Ceylan et dans les pays de l'Asie du Sud-Est, ces biens restent confiés à des administrateurs laïcs, mais en Chine et sans doute aussi les communautés mahāyānistes d'Asie centrale' Jacques Gernet, Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du Ve au Xe siècle, 1956, p.74.

the saṅgha[1] both exaggerate and misrepresent the actual conditions. The administrative organization evolved to divest the saṅgha of its responsibility of managing monastic property seem to have successfully met this need in some of the monasteries. But in monasteries like the Abhayagiri, the monks were drawn into association with the very tasks that they were trying to avoid.

Of the many duties of the monastic administration, the collection of dues from landed property and villages belonging to the monastery would have been one of the foremost. It has been suggested that at least part of this duty was passed over to a class of middle-men. Several references occur in the inscriptions dealing with monastic property to the 'practice of taking käbäli' as well as to a group of individuals called 'recipients of käbäli'. Käbäli has been interpreted by L. S. Perera as 'a system by which the produce was collected and handed over to the vihāra and other responsibilities discharged for a part of the produce or may be for the payment of a fixed sum to the vihāra.'[2] It has been compared with the system of pāṭṭa.

Paranavitana suggests that pāṭṭa was derived from Skt. pāthya which denotes the instrument of lease and that pāṭṭaladuvan were 'a class of middle-men who farmed the revenues due from the tenant on behalf of the lord of the village'.[3] The Koṇḍavaṭṭavan inscription decrees that pāṭṭaladuvan were to enjoy the land without evicting the tenants and were to

---

[1] W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon p.135.

[2] L. S. Perera, Institutions.... p.1248.

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 127-128.

refrain from cultivating the land themselves.[1] The Mihintale Tablets categorically state that the land belonging to the monastery should not be given on pāṭṭa.[2] But conditions at the Abhayagiri, according to Paranavitana, were different. This monastery, he maintains, 'permitted its lands, at least some of them, to be managed by revenue farmers'.[3]

The acceptance of both or either of these interpretations would imply that part of the income of at least some of the monasteries depended on a class of middle-men who made a profit by taking a share of the income for themselves. Apart from the obvious economic reason of the loss of a part of the income, there were other factors which made such an arrangement undesirable. Difficulties could arise in giving over land which enjoyed many immunities, to private individuals for the administration of revenue. Further, the peasant was bound to suffer from extortion under such a system It has already been noted that the Mihintale Tablets specifically prohibited this practice. Hence it would be relevant to re-examine the evidence basic to the interpretations given above, to test their validity.

A tenth-century inscription from Anurādhapura refers both to the practice of 'taking käbäli' and to individuals who held käbäli. In granting immunities to the Isuramenu monastery, it states: 'käbäli shall not be taken from the land around the monastery, on both sides of the strea as also from the land of the eight hundred and seven who hold käbäli from

---

[1] EZ Vol. V Pt. I p. 140.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.43-44.

[3] EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 127-128.

the monastery'.[1] It is very unlikely that the Isuramenu monastery had so many as eight hundred and seven middlemen for the collection of its dues. The term käbäli is known to occur in the combination demeḷ käbäli,[2] which has been taken by most scholars as denoting the allotments made over to Tamil employees in remuneration for their services. In many inscriptions, lands are exempted from 'the taking of käbäli' (käbäli noganna). This would amount to an undertaking given by the king not to allocate land or revenue from the area to his retainers. In a general sense käbäli could have also denoted allotment of land given over for cultivation. Hence the eight hundred and seven people mentioned in this record may be those who held the land of the monastery in return for service and for cultivation.

This leaves us with the interpretation that the lands of the monasteries were given away on the paṭṭa tenure. Paranavitana's interpretation of the term stands to reason; but his contention that some villages of the Abhayagiri monastery were given out on this basis does not appear to be justified. The evidence basic to this conclusion is a statement in the inscription of Kassapa V at this monastery: 'If officials and those who farmed the revenues of villages sought refuge with the saṅgha, any debts due from them may be recovered after investigation; but they should not be subjected to any other form of censure.'[3] Paranavitana presumes that

[1] veherā käbäli gannā aṭasiyä sat hä ätuḷu koṭ hoyin eterä meterä vehera avaṭa käbäli noganna isa. EZ Vol. I p.33 ll.23-24.

[2] EZ Vol. III pp. 143, 274; Vol. IV p.41.

[3] kämikam kaḷayun gam paṭṭa väḷanduvan saṅgun karā vana vicāra koṭ gata yutu ṇayak ganut mut sesu niga nokaranu isa. EZ Vol. I p.47 ll.26-27. vana has been used in the sense of 'sought refuge' in the preceding statements: mini koṭa saṅgun van tänat van kenekun...sesu biyen van keneku... ll. 24, 25.

this refers to officials and revenue farmers who owed debts to the monastery. It would be rather strange, however, if those who owed debts to the monastery sought refuge with the saṅgha. The meaning of the passage becomes clearer if the context in which it occurs is taken into consideration. This particular portion of the record deals with immunities granted to the monastery, which included exemption from interference by state officials. Complications arose when men wanted by the law entered the precincts of a monastery and the last few statements preceding the one in question deal with the procedure to be followed when criminals who had committed murder and other grave offences sought refuge within monastic grounds. Taken in this context, the officials and revenue farmers concerned seem to have been men who owed debts to the state and were, therefore, wanted by the royal officials rather than those who owed debts to the monastery itself. Hence it would be wrong to conclude, on the strength of this statement, that some villages belonging to the Abhayagiri monastery had been farmed out for the collection of revenue.

On the other hand, the fact that the monastic officials were in close and direct contact with the tenants is implicit in the regulations in the inscriptions, intended to protect the tenant from their unjust demands. It is tempting to suppose that the lands situated at a distance from the monastery were given out on paṭṭa. But there are direct references at least in the Mihintale Tablets, to officials going away from the monastery on administrative errands. The officials who went on tours were advised not to accept any food or presents from the tenants apart from the

quota of rice that they were entitled to by tradition.[1] This would suggest that such tours were an established practice.

The grants of immunity from interference by state officials made to some of the monasteries transferred to the monastic officials the duty of administering justice in the land and the villages which came under their control. It is evident that cases concerning at least the less severe offences came under the jurisdiction of these monasteries.[2] Specific evidence is found in the Mihintale Tablets. Among the regulations laid down for the guidance of monks and officials, it is stated that fines were to be levied for offences committed by householders (kuḍin); the guilty party was to be made to pay the fine in cash or in labour at the rate of an allotment of work in irrigation work (presumably dredging reservoirs), sixteen cubits in circumference and one in depth, for each aka of the levy.[3]

The monastic administration, it appears, had to attend to the collection of revenue and, at least in some cases, also to other aspects of administration like the enforcement of law and order. But its main concern would have been the maintenance of the monks and the monastery. For this purpose, the monastery maintained a considerably large labour force. Inscriptions draw a distinction, though not very clearly, between the officials (kämi, Skt. karmī) and the other minor employees (dasun). Some of the latter were domestic employees who attended to such chores as the preparation of food

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A46-48. See also p.284.

[2] See p.280

[3] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll. A51-53. See also p.280 ff.

and ministering to the personal needs of the monks.[1] Some were craftsmen while others were labourers who would have been employed in irrigation work, agriculture and in work connected with religious ceremonies. This labour force seems to have been recruited by three different means: some were paid employees, some were slaves or bondsmen while others were tenants of the monastery performing their corvée duty.

Apart from providing the monks with food, robes and medical needs,[2] one of the most important duties of the monastic administration was the maintenance of its buildings in good repair. Certain monasteries maintained a permanent staff of craft smen for renovation work. According to the ninth-century Sanskrit inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery stone-cutters (śilākuṭṭaka) and carpenters (takṣaka) were to be alloted one and a half kiri of fields from the villages set apart to finance renovation work at the monastery (navakarmagrāme). In addition, they were also given a piece of dry land for growing 'inferior grains'. A similar allotment was made to the functionary who supervised their work. They were given two months and five days to finish their work and were to be deprived of their allotments in cases of failure to abide by this stipulation.[3] Unfortunatel no information is available on the exact strength of this labour force.

In this context, the Mihintale Tablets prove more useful as they furnish a detailed list of employees. The kamanavāmā käbiḷi jeṭak seems

[1] See e.g. EZ Vol. I p. 93 ll. 41, 45.

[2] See pp. 207 ff.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.25-32.

to have been the employee in charge of repairs. He was allotted a kiri of land and a daily allowance of an admanā and one pat of rice. He had under him twelve men who were termed käbili. They received the same allowance but only two pā of land.[1] It is not certain why they were termed käbili; one possibility is that they were in charge of 'sections' of the monastery.

At the head of the band of craftsmen was the chief master artisan (vaḍu maha ädurak) who received the dry land of Boṇḍvehera as his allotment. Under him there were two master artisans (ädaru vaḍu). The largest group of workmen were the eight workers termed sirvaḍu. Gunasekara, who held that sir was equivalent to Skt. sirā, translated it as 'basket-makers'. Müller and Wickremasinghe compared the term with siriyaru and took it to be derived from churikā-vardhaka to translate it as 'carver'.[2] Siriyaru occurs in the Ruvanmalnighaṇḍu as the term for 'carpenter', which is inappropriate in this context.[3] A more plausible explanation would be to compare it with Tamil sirpar and to translate it as 'stone-worker'. There were two workmen called uḷuvaḍu. This may be translated as 'brick-makers', 'brick-masons' or in a general sense as 'architects'. All these twelve employees were entitled to a share from the income from Vaḍudevāgama (Devāgama of the artisans). In addition to them, there were two carpenters (kaṭuvaḍu) who received one kiri each, two master lapidaries (miṇir maha

[1] EZ Vol. I p.97 ll. B48-50.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.112 n.2.

[3] Ruvanmalnighṇḍu p. 77 no. 396.

äduru) receiving three kiri each and two blacksmiths (kambur) getting one kiri each. The village Sunuboldevägama (Devägama of the lime-burners) was allotted to the lime-burners. For its transport work, the monastery employed six carters and the village Damunugama was set apart for this purpose. It does not necessarily imply that these villages were in fact given to the employees concerned. It may be merely that the residents of these two villages were required to provide the lime required by the monastery and the carters for its transport work.[1]

Substantial resources were set apart for repairs at the Cetiyagiri monastery. One payala from Damgamiya and two kiri from Älgamiya were to be used for repairs at Kaṭumahasäya and Kiribandpavudägäba respectively while all the offerings received at these two shrines as well as the shrines of the main monastery, in addition to ten yälas of paddy and one hundred kalandas of gold were set apart for repairs at the main monastery.[2] It is evident that every year the monastery employed a considerable labour force for this purpose. Such a system would have ensured the self-sufficiency of the monastery and its independence from the support of the king for its maintenance.

A tenth-century record from the Abhayagiri monastery states that the income from the villages and the land set apart for meeting the cost of repairs should be used for that purpose alone. If there were no such funds, whatever was leftfrom funds set aside for food and clothing was used. And

[1] EZ Vol. I p.97 ll. B44-48.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 92-93 ll.A31-37.

if there was no balance left from the funds set apart for food, half of the funds set apart for robes was to be used for repairs. Monks who failed to carry out these instructions were to be expelled from the monastery.[1] This passage suggests that some monasteries were not kept in good repair. At the same time, it hints at the possible prevalence of monasteries which did not possess funds to meet the cost of renovation work. Thus it cannot be said that all monasteries were independent of the king's support.

The chronicles contain many instances of kings undertaking restoration work at monasteries. Even the larger and better endowed monasteries sometime accepted their help in this respect. Niśśaṅka Malla assigned an official, Loke arakmēnāvan, to serve at the Ruvanvälisäya and charged him with the task of restoring the shrines of Anurādhapura using the extensive funds placed at his disposal.[2] The term arakmēnā occurs in the Pūjāvaliya;[3] it also occurs in the Siṃhala Bodhivaṃsa as the equivalent for P. ārakkha-pāricariya,[4] a post which carried the duty of guarding the Bo-tree. The help of the king in restoration work was most needed and generously given after foreign invasions as in the reigns of Sena I and Udaya IV and after the period of Coḷa occupation.[5]

Some of the craftsmen mentioned in the preceding list, like blacksmith and lapidaries, would have been employed also to produce equipment needed by

[1] EZ Vol. I p.236 ll.40-44.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.80 ll.29-32.

[3] Pjv. 15.

[4] Siṃhala Bodhivaṃśaya (Dhammaratana ed.) p.194.

[5] Cv., 51.69, 77; 54.44, 45, 48.

the monastery. Apart from them, there was a group of craftsmen who catered specifically to these needs of the mon astery. The Mihintale Tablet: list five potters (kumbal) who were given one kiri of land each. They were to supply five vessels a day. Another potter was allowed two kiri of land and a daily allowance of two admanā of rice in return for supplying ten bowls and ten water-pots every month. Lastly, one kiri and two payas were allotted to an employee, most probably a weaver, who supplied the monastery with a water-strainer every month.[1] It is also possible that weavers were employed to produce robes for monks. According to the Samanta-pāsādikā, it was possible for monks to accept weavers and dyers as ārāmikas[2] In fact, the Abhayagiri monastery owned a weavers' village.[3]

The Sanskrit inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery speaks of the pañcakaulikas who worked on the grounds of the monastery. Their work was apportioned out to them and they were held responsible for the completion of their assignments within the stipulated time of two months and five days[4] A similar term occurs in the chronicles. According to the Cūḷvaṃsa, king Māna who built the Uttaromūla granted the pañcapessavaggas to it.[5] Pessa and pesiya mean 'servant'.[6] Geiger translated the term as 'five groups of servitors'.[7] The term occurs in variant form in two later instances. Kitt:

---

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 75-113 ll.B27-29,37.

[2] Smp., p.683.

[3] Cv., 41.96.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.29-30.

[5] Cv 57.21.

[6] Pali Dictionary (PTS) See pessiya.

[7] Cv., trsl. Pt. I 194.

sirimegha, seeking a reconciliation with the young prince Parakkamabāhu, sent the pañcapessiyavaggas to him, along with a letter and presents.[1] Parakkamabāhu II (1287-1293) assigned the five pesiyavaggas and the ten pesiyavaggas who served at the palace to work for the saṅgha .[2]

The term is probably equivalent to pañca-kammālār and añju-çāttiyār in Tamil. But it is not possible to arrive at a definite conclusion on the constitution of these groups. One Tamil list gives goldsmiths, copper-smiths, stone-workers, carpenters and blacksmiths as forming the five groups.[3] Two lists from Ceylon found in the Abhidhānappadīpikāsannaya and the Mahārūpasiddhisannaya agree in saying that the five kulas were constituted of carpenters, weavers, dyers or washermen (rajaka), barbers and leather-workers.[4] The Appannaka Jātaka refers to the five low castes (pañcasu nīca kulesu) and theJātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya explains them as composed of musicians (?veṇa), hunters, chariot-makers, scavengers and the caṇḍālas.[5] It is not possible to decide in favour of any of these lists. But it may be pointed out that the Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya is the oldest among these works.

The references to kings offering these craftsmen to monasteries sug-

---

[1] Cv., 67.58.

[2] Cv., 84.5. The Pjv. uses the term mē tān in place of pesiyavagga.

[3] Tamil Lexicon p.2403. taṭṭān, kannān, cirpan, taccan, kollan. Cankattakaradi.

[4] Abhidānappadīpikā Sannaya (Paññāmoli, 1895) p.69. Mahārupasiddhisannaya (Dhammaratana, 1926) p.418.

[5] Jātaka (Faüsboll) Vol. I p.106; JAG p.53. The term rathakāra could also mean leather workers. Jātaka Sannaya (Dhammaratana, 1927) p.511.

gests that slavery was one of the sources of labour that the monasteries depended on. The Samantapāsādika forbids the saṅgha to accept slaves, but in the same breath sanctions their acceptance if they were offered as ārāmikas and kappiyakārakas.[1] Some inscriptions from the seventh and eighth centuries, found in monastic precincts, refer to people releasing themselves or others from slavery by paying a fee which amounted at times to a figure as high as one hundred kahāpanas.[2] Doubts have been cast by some scholars on the validity of the evidence from these inscriptions. They deny that the term vaharala which occurs in these records meant 'slavery'.[3] But, even if this evidence is discarded, the prevalence of slavery at monasteries seems beyond doubt. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, Silāmeghavaṇṇa (619-628) gran captives taken in battle as slaves to monasteries.[4] Aggabodhi IV (667-683), Potthakuṭṭha and Sena I (833-853) provided the various religious establishments they founded with slaves.[5] The Galpātavihāra inscription is even more specific. It mentions two types of slaves - 'hereditary' (anvayāgata) and 'bought' slaves (ranvahalin). In fact, it records an actual instance of purchase of slaves with gold belonging to a monastery. It also lists eighty-three slaves, in groups of families, as having been granted to serve the monastery in various capacities as cowherds, potters and tailors.[6]

---

[1] Smp., p.683.

[2] EZ Vol. IV p.133; p. 144; pp. 285-296.

[3] UCR Vol. X pp. 103-120. See also Paranavitana's reply EZ Vol. V Pt. I pp. 35-65.

[4] Cv., 44.73.

[5] Cv., 46.10, 20; 50.64.

[6] EZ Vol. IV pp. 206-207 11.12-23.

It would appear that the monastery was also entitled to labour and services by the tenants who held its lands. Most grants of immunities state that royal officials were not to take väriyan from within the lands of the monastery. An inscription from Noccipotāna categorically lays down that väri should not be taken for irrigation work.[1] Similarly, a record from Dorabāvila stipulates that väriyan or buffaloes were not to be seized for irrigation work even if the twelve main reservoirs had been destroyed.[2] One may presume that these grants made the villages immune from their men and cattle being mustered by royal officials for irrigation work. In fact, väri has been used in the Kavsiḷumiṇa in the sense of 'servant'.[3]

Grants of immunities from service due to the king would have implied that these rights were turned over to the monasteries. Vārika, which is probably the Sanskrit equivalent of väri, occurs in the Sanskrit inscriptio from Abhayagiri.[4] In this record, vārikas occur in one instance with the karmakāras and in another instance between the kārakas and the karmakāras as one of the parties held responsible in case of failure to complete their assignments according to stipulation. According to the Samantapāsādikā, vihāravārikas were to be employed to keep watch over the belongings of the monks.[5] The Sāratthadīpanī, its commentary, explains that vihāravārikas were those who took turns in guarding the monasteries.[6] Vārikas need not

[1] gaṅg kaḍaṭ väri noganna isā EZ Vol. II p. 7 ll. ß12-14.

[2] doḷos mahavā sunad väriyan mīvun noganna isā EZ Vol. V Pt. II p.295 ll.C8-12. Väriyan has been generally translated as 'labourers' and 'workmen'. But the editor of this inscription makes a curious suggestion: 'Since the word (i.e. väriyan) occurs with gon and mīvun can it not mean a kind of oxen?'. p.298.

[3] Kavsiḷumiṇa v.615.

(cont.)

necessarily have been laymen; but in the context of inscriptional evidence cited, there is hardly any doubt that they were laymen. The evidence in the Mihintale Tablets makes one more certain about this question. Here, it is stipulated that the monastery should avail itself of the 'three-day turn of service' (tun dāvar) but should not levy other forms of corvée like service on poya days.[1] This not only confirms that the monastery enjoyed the right to free labour but also suggests by implication that this right was sometimes abused. The grant made by Vijayabāhu I to a monastery of the residents of the district of Ālisāra has already been discussed.[2] It may be cited as an indication of the continued prevalence of the right of the monasteries to corvée labour.

On considering the conditions of service of the employees of the monasteries, one would notice that almost all the employees were given allotment of land. In the Mihintale and Kaludiyapokuṇa inscriptions, these allotments are termed divel (var. jivel). The Sanskrit inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery uses the term jīvitadāna, which is presumably the Sanskrit equivalent of the word. This has been translated as 'maintenance'. In the inscription of Kassapa V at the same premises, the officials of the monastery

(cont.)

[4] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.23-24, 30-31.

[5] The editor of the P.T.S. edition has preferred the reading vihāracārika and gives vihāravārika as a variant form. Ca and va are easily mistaken for each other in the Sinhalese script. There is little doubt that the original reading was vihāravārika as the Sāratthadīpani, the commentary on the Smp. comments on this term. Smp p.357.

[6] vihāravāriko, vāraṃ katvā viharārakkhanako. Sāratthadīpanī p.516.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A44. See also p.283-284.

[2] See p.120

were directed to hold land and the villages of the main monastery only on the dasakärä tenure.[1] Another inscription at Abhayagiri reveals that other employees, too, held land on the dasakärä tenure.[2] The term divel does not occur in any of these records.

Wickremasinghe has tried to explain dasakärä variously as 'tenth part' and 'servile tenure'.[3] Dasa yields to either interpretation. The Samantapāsādikā, while commenting on the word bhāgam in the Vinaya Piṭaka, equates it with dasamabhāgam and adds that the custom of paying atenth of the yield to the owner of the land was known in ancient India.[4] A tenth-century inscription from Anurādhapura reveals that 'recipients of allotments (käbäli laduvan) were entitled to a tenth part of the produce of dry land.[5]

On the other hand, if dasa is taken in the sense of 'employees', it would take the other meaning. In both the contexts of its incidence, dasakärä indicates a tenure of land as held by employees of the monastery. The fact that the term jivel does not occur in these records suggests that dasakärä had been used in its place. But, owing to the paucity of evidence, it is not possible to decide in favour of any of these interpretations.

In addition to land, the employees at the Cetiyagiri monastery were allotted daily allowances of rice. The Abhayagiri inscriptinn of Kassapa V

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.46-47.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.236 l.48.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 56, 103 n.2, 240 n.1.

[4] Vin., Vol. I p.250; Smp., p.1103.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.236 l.48.

refers to wages (dasun vaṭākam) being paid to the employees of the monastery. Another record from the Abhayagiri monastery and the Kaludiyapokuṇa inscriptions refers to employees receiving nimi.[2] Wickremasinghe interpreted this as a land tenure. Paranavitana assumed that it was derived from Skt. nivī meaning 'capital' or 'stock'.[3] Nimi is probably the same as nima which occurs in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gäṭapadaya. In two instances nima is given as the Sinhalese term for nivāpa. In another instance vaṭṭa (wage) is translated as nima and sēvābäḷa.[4] Thus all these four terms seem to have been synonymous and meant 'wage'. This 'wage' would have been paid in grain as the term nivāpa itself originally meant 'grain'.

It has been pointed out elsewhere that some of the employees at the Cetiyagiri monastery received an allowance of clothing.[5] According to the Mihintale Tablets, the employees were dressed in an upper garment, a lower garment and a headdress.[6] The Daḷadāsirita stipulates that the employees serving at the shrine of the Tooth relic should be dressed in their tunics (säṭṭa) and their headdresses (mayilakaṭṭu).[7] It is possible that there were similar regulations about dress even in earlier times. The Cetiyagiri monastery had even set apart three kiri of land to employ two washermen to launder the garments of its employees.[8]

---

[1] saṅgun däsan vaṭākam here, most probably, refer to payments made to the and the employees, as separate provision was made in another part of the inscription for the supply of food. EZ Vol. I p.49 l.53.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.236 l.48; Vol. III p.265 l.30.

[3] EZ Vol. III p.267 n.2.

[4] DAG pp. 76, 161, 226.

[5] See p.209.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.97 Il.B53-54. (cont.)

The high emoluments that the craftsmen received is a striking feature of the rates of payment followed at the Cetiyagiri monastery. The master lapidaries received three kiri each, the highest payment made to any employee outside the committee of management. The potter, the painter, the florist and the astronomer[1] came next, having received two kiris. The cooks and the washermen received as much land as administrative officials like the pirivahanu vata kämi and the rajge upäni kämi. It is also interesting that the carpenters at the Abhayagiri monastery received a higher wage than their counterparts at Mihintale. The Abhayagiri records set apart one and a half kiri of fields and a plot of dry land for a carpenter while at Mihintale he would receive only one kiri of land. In all, the Cetiyagiri monastery maintained more than a hundred and seventy employees. In land alone, a hundred and seven kiri and three payas, an allotment of dry land and the dues from five villages were kept apart as payment for their services.

The records of the ninth and tenth centuries reveal the existence of monasteries endowed with extensive sources of income and of labour, and possessing an elaborately organized system of administration. Thus it possessed an immense potentiality for economic activity. This was restrained to some extent by the fact that the administration had little independence in utilizing its resources; most of the endowments were made for

(cont.)

[7] Daladāsirita p.51.

[8] EZ Vol. I p.97 ll. B53-54.

---

[1] See p.338.

specific purposes. There is one instance of an endowment being made at a monastery to finance the construction of a dam.[1] The participation of the monasteries in such activities as the construction and the development of irrigation work is evident even in the Mihintale Tablets. For, according to this record, offenders from the villages of the monastery were to be made to work at dredging tanks if they were unable to pay up the fines levied on them.[2]

In the whole of South Asia, it is only in Ceylon that such detailed evidence is available on the administrative organization of Buddhist monasteries, even though the information available in these sources, too, is by no means adequate. The administrative needs arising from the growth of temporalities were met to some extent by the adaptation of institutions meant originally for disciplinary purposes, like the general assembly of monks and the committee of inquiry. At the same time, the attempt to keep the monks away from the actual participation in the management of property led to the rise of an organized lay administration. Certain similarities are noticeable between what obtains in Ceylon and the administrative organization of the Hindu temple of South India in the form of the institutions as well as in some administrative practices and regulations. But this similarity seems to be due more to the common features in the social and political institutions of the two countries on which the monastic organization would

---

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 163-171.

[2] See p. 179.

have been based, rather than to one being directly influenced by the other.

Even if the administrative organization of monasteries did not completely relieve the monks from involvement in the management of monastic property, it played an important role in strengthening the cohesive principle which bound together a number of monasteries to form a nikāya. It is evident that the minor monasteries belonging to the nikāya had to submit their annual statements of accounts for scrutiny to committees appointed by the main monastery. In the case of the Cetiyagiri monastery, monks representing the two mulas of the Abhayagiri nikāya participated in the meeting which settled their annual accounts and submitted the annual statement for ratification by the general assembly of the main monastery. Monks from the main monastery settled disputes at the minor institutions. This contact on an administrative level would have helped to keep alive the relationship between the main monastery and the dependent institutions attached to the nikāya.

Obviously enough, the origin as well as the functioning of this administrative organization was closely associated with and dependent on the temporalities. Hence the spoliation of monastic property in the period of Cola rule and in the period between the death of Vijayabāhu I and the accession of Parakkamabāhu I should have, one would expect, brought about the virtual collapse of the administrative organization. This in turn would have severely curtailed the control the main monastery wielded over the other constituents of the nikāya. An inscription from the time of Kalyānavatī (1202-1208), found near the Ruvanvälisäya, shows that the monastery had clerks, samdaruvan (high officials), appraisers (vannakuvarun)

and accountants (pasakun) in its employ.[1] But there is no evidence to suggest that the elaborate administrative organization which obtained in the tenth century at the Abhayagiri and Cetiyagiri monasteries was ever resuscitated in or after the time of Parakkamabāhu I.

---

[1] EZ Vol. IV pp. 253-260.

Chapter 4.

MONASTIC LIFE AND RELATIONS WITH THE LAITY

The development of the monastery into a highly organized institution controlling extensive resources had a decisive effect on the life and ideals of Buddhist monks. The total dependence of the monk on the voluntary donations of the laity had been a characteristic feature of religious life in early Buddhism. This was no longer necessary. The monastery provided the monk with the needs for his sustenance and the opportunity to lead a life devoted to scholarship and contemplation. Yet, in a sense, the monastery brought the saṅgha into closer contact with the laity. For it was not a mere residence for monks; it was also the venue for congregations of the lay community for educational purposes, for religious discussion and for the performance of ceremonial. Further, the monastery facilitated the regulation of clerical life. Monastic records dated in the period under review contain compilations of regulations selected by the saṅgha, sometimes at the instigation of the king. These compilations, called sirit or katikā, sought to regulate and systematize various aspects of clerical life as the recruitment and training of monks, their organization, payment of allowances and even their routine and the daily allowance of food. In return for the amenities it provided the monastery demanded strict adherence to its rules. Violation of the rules was an offence punishable with expulsion from the monastery.

A constant supply of recruits was necessary to maintain the monasteries at full strength. The ranks of the saṅgha were periodically depleted by 'purifications' of the Order. In times of political turmoil, monks were sometimes forced to leave the Island or give up robes. Kassapa V who laicized monks for lapses in discipline recruited young monks to fill their places.[1] Vijayabāhu I held a ceremony of ordination after capturing Rājaraṭṭha from the Coḷas.[2] Each year, Parakkamāhu I used to hold a similar ceremony in a pavilion erected on boats anchored in the middle of the river Mahavāli.[3] Nissaṅka Malla, too, claims to have held an annual ceremony of ordination.[4]

Evidently, there was no difficulty in attracting recruits, at least in times of peace. Apart from religious considerations, the ease and comfort of monastic life would have had a great attraction for the laity. The monks were provided with food, clothing and, in certain cases, even with a personal income. They were exempt from taxes and corvée duty. In addition to these benefits, the monk occupied a position of prestige and honour in the society. While discoursing on the advantages of clerical life, the author of the Pūjāvaliya, himself a monk, refers to the immunity that the monk enjoyed from being harassed by royal officials who toured the country to collect taxes. He also points out that a monk is not obliged to rise

---

[1] Cv., 52.44.

[2] Cv., 60.4-8.

[3] Cv., 78.28-30.

[4] EZ Vol. II p.111 l.A23.

from his seat on seeing the king, the heir-apparent or a minister; he could remain seated without fear of punishment.[1]

In fact, it was these material advantages which attracted some men to monastic life. Men who were not suited to the disciplined life of the monastery did not leave it as they wanted to enjoy the worldly benefits it offered. Parakkamabāhu I disrobed 'many hundreds' of sinful monks'who would ruin the Order in their quest for gain' and offered them lucrative positions in lay life.[2] This problem finds clearer expression in the Ruvanvälisāya inscription of Nissaṅka Malla where he speaks about his 'purification' of the saṅgha:

> 'His Majesty realized that those monks who lead impure lives and those who have lost interest in monastic life do not leave the Order through fear of the duties (i.e. duties to the government incumbent upon laymen). Hence he declared that those monks who leave the robes without defiling the Order would be exempted from their duties; they would also receive gold, clothes, food, iron, seed-paddy, cattle and other needs.'[3]

In another record, Nissaṅka Malla reminds the monks that the enjoyment of amenities provided for them without practising the prescribed virtues would certainly lead to birth in hell.[4]

---

[1] ...daḍa muḍa isran masran illā āviduṇā rājapurusayangen piḍā noviṇḍima sataravana suva viṇḍimaya... raja yuvaraja maha āmatiyan dutu kala bhaya nātiva hunasnen noṇāngi hiṇḍima satvana suva viṇḍimaya. Pujavaliya (Bentoṭa Saddhātissa, 1930) p.22.

[2] Cv., 78.9,26. EZ Vol. II p.269 l.12.

[3] EZ Vol. II p.79 ll.15-18.

[4] EZ Vol. II p.97 ll.7-8.

This was a problèm which necessitated periodical laicizations. It underlined the need for the exercise of caution in recruitment and the institution of strict regulations designed to maintain a high standard of discipline among the saṅgha. The regulations in the Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V instruct the saṅgha not to admit too young youths into the Order and forbid them to accept presents from novices who sought ordination. Those monks who received such presents as well as those who gave them forfeited their right to live in the monastery.[1] Nissaṅka Malla exhorts the saṅgha to admit new recruits only after thorough investigation to prevent 'deceitful, crafty and sinful men' from entering the Order.[2]

According to the Anurādhapura slab inscription, the knowledge of the satarbaṇavar section of the Canon was an essential prerequisite for ordination; this was expected to take about three months to master.[3] In the Polonnaru Katikāvata, the rehearsal of the Heraṇasikha, the Sekhiyā and the Dasadhamma Sutta and the practice of contemplation in seclusion are recommended for the novice.[4] When and if the novices were of the correct age, they were ordained with the prior sanction of the assembly.

A newly ordained monk was required to serve a period of apprenticeship (nisa = P. nissayà) under a senior monk. The Galvihāra inscription mentions

---

[1] EZ Vol. I pp.48-49 ll.38-39, 48.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.97 ll.5-7.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.48 l.38; Vol. III p.264 l.21.

[4] EZ Vol. II p.270 l.23.

monks called gaṇadetutera who were placed in charge of groups of such apprentices. These 'group leaders' were responsible to their superiors (mahatera) for the education and discipline of the monks in their charge. They were to be punished for failure in the execution of their duties. The 'group leaders' were instructed not to accept a monk from another group without first receiving a letter from or seeing a representative of the senior monk of that group. It was the duty of the 'group leader' to guide his charges to a career of scholarship (granthadhura) or a life of contemplation (vidarśanādhura) in accordance with their particular talents and inclinations.[1]

Rāhula has drawn attention to the three stages of scriptural scholarship mentioned in the Samantapāsādikā - the nissaya samucchanaka reached after five years from ordination, parisupaṭṭāpaka attained after another five years and the final stage called the bhikkhunovādaka when a monk was considered sufficiently qualified to act as an adviser to nuns.[2] The Samantapāsādikā outlines in detail the texts that the monk had to master in each of these three stages. No such detailed information is available from the sources of the period under consideration. Apparently, the Galvihāra inscription considers only the first stage.

According to the Samantapāsādikā the monks of the first stage should commit to memory the two mātikās (i.e. the Pātimokkha section of the Vinaya

[1] EZ Vol. II pp.270-273 ll.18-25, 29-30, 51.

[2] Rāhula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, pp. 294-296. Smp. Vol. IV pp. 788-790.

Piṭaka) the four Bhāṇavāras, the three Anumodanās, particulars about eccleciastical acts like the Uposatha and the Pavāraṇa, and the Ambaṭṭha, Mahā-Rāhulovāda and Andhakavinda Suttas. According to the Sāratthadīpani, discourses dealing with the merits accruing to patrons of the saṅgha delivered on receiving offerings, the Maṅgala Sutta recited at monastic eeremonies and the Tirokudda Sutta recited at funerals represent the three Anumodanās. It goes on to explain that the particulars regarding eccleciastical acts mentioned in the Samantapāsādikā are those given in the Kammavagga in the Parivāra section of the Vinaya Piṭaka.[1] Of the three Suttas recommended for newly ordained monks, the Mahā-Rāhulovāda[2] deals with the practice of the ānāpānāsati - the system of meditation based on concentration on the respiratory process. The Ambaṭṭha Sutta[3] describes the victory of the Buddha in a dispute with a caste-conscious Brāhmaṇa youth. Five topics on which newly ordained monks have to be instructed are outlined in the Andhakavinda Sutta.[4]

The laconic comments of Sāriputta on the passage in the Samantapāsādikā concerning the training of monks yield little information on the organization of education in his own period. Fortunately, there is some helpful evidence in the Galvihāra inscription. This record differs from the Samantapāsādikā

---

[1] Sāratthadīpanī (Devarakkhita ed. 1914) pp. 819-820.

[2] Majjhima Nikāya (PTS) Vol. I pp.420-426.

[3] Dīgha Nikāya (PTS) Vol. I pp. 87-110.

[4] Aṅguttara Nikāya (PTS) Vol. III pp. 138-9.

in the texts it recommends for newly ordained monks. They were to rehearse at least the Khuddasikkhā and the Pātimokkha of the Vinaya Piṭaka and the Dasadhamma and the Anumāna Suttas of the Sutta Piṭaka.[1] The Dasadhamma Sutta is probably the same as the Dhamma Sutta in the Akkosavogga of the Aṅguttara Nikāya.[2] It outlines ten points which the monks had to be constantly mindful of. In the Anumāna Sutta,[3] Moggallāna enjoins the saṅgha to the regular practice of introspection with a view to correcting false ideas. It may be surmised that this initiation into the study of canonical texts was followed up by specialization in one of the three branches of the Canon - the Abhidhamma, Sutta or the Vinaya. At the Cetiyagiri monastery, monks who studied the Canon were rewarded with emoluments which varied according to the branch in which they specialized.[4]

Special importance was attached to the study of the Abhidhamma. Monks who specialized in this field received the highest emoluments. Provision was made at the Abhayagiri monastery for the study of the treatises of both Theravāda and non-Theravāda schools.[5] Buddhaghosa points out that no particular texts were recommended in the ancient commentaries for the study of the Abhidhamma.[6] While explaining Buddhaghosa's statements on the teaching

[1] EZ Vol. II p.270 ll.19-20.

[2] Aṅguttara Nikāya (PTS) Vol. V pp. 87-88.

[3] Majjhima Nikāya (PTS) Vol. I pp. 95-100.

[4] See p. 213

[5] See p. 372

[6] Smp. p.789.

of the Abhidhamma, Sāriputta substitutes the term nāmarūpapariccheda for Abhidhamma.[1] If we identify this as a reference to the work of Anuruddha kno by this name, it is possible to suggest that the Nāmarūpapariccheda was a popular text used for the study of the Abhidhamma in the time of Sāriputta. References in other commentaries of this period suggest that the Mūlaṭīkā of Ānanda was another popular text.[2]

In the period under consideration, texts on the Abhidhamma were held in such high regard that festivals were held in their honour.[3] The chronicle records special recitals of the Abhidhamma held at the request of kings. One such recital took place in the reign of Sena II.[4] Mahinda IV had the Abhidhamma recited by the thera Daṭhanāga of the Araññika fraternity. At the request of the same king, another scholar, Dhammamitta of the Sitthagāma parivena, wrote a commentary on the Abhidhamma Piṭaka.[5] The emphasis laid on the study of the Abhidhamma does not necessarily imply that other branches of the Canon were neglected. Mahinda IV also arranged a recital of the Vinaya by learned monks.[6] Vijayabāhu I had the Canon copied and presented to the saṅgha.[7] Monks like Kassapa of Dimbulāgala were versed in all the three parts of the Canon. The exegetical works produced during this period, too, deal with all three sections.

---

[1] Sāratthadīpanī p.820.

[2] See p. 216

[3] See p. 330

[4] Cv., 51.79.

[5] Cv., 54.35-36.

[6] Cv., 54.34.

[7] Cv, 60.22.

Apparently, a career of studies in the scriptures was considered preferable to a life of contemplation. According to the Galvihāra inscription the monks who were directed to a life of meditation were those who failed to meet the demands of a career of scholarship. But even these monks had to devote some time to the scriptures. They were advised to constantly contemplate on the Dasadhamma Sutta. They had to commit to memory the Mūlasikkhā and the Sekhiya and to thoroughly rehearse the Sikhavalañdavinisa so that they would be able to repeat any section of the text on being questioned at bi-annual intervals. Despite the preference for scholarship, the advantages of meditation were not forgotten. Every monk was advised to practise meditation on a topic (kamaṭahana) selected to suit the needs of his character.

After this initial period of 'apprenticeship (nissaya)' a monk could live independently. Presumably, he would be assigned to a hermitage or monastery. It was the duty of the saṅgha of the main monastery of a nikāya to maintain the number of monks at hermitages attached to it at the strength prescribed by the patrons.[2] A ninth-century Sanskrit inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery specifies that the strength of the Lahasikā hermitage should be maintained at three senior monks and two novices. The incumbents of a monastery or hermitage seem to have been vested with the 'care' of a prescribed area. The monks of the Lahasikā hermitage, for instance, had to 'loo

[1] EZ Vol. II p.270 ll.22-23.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.40-41. Wickremasinghe's translation is inaccurate.

after' Lahasikā, Uruḷgonu and the villages set apart for repairs and the provision of robes.[1] The Anurādhapura slab inscription lays down that seniority was to be taken into consideration at the selection of monks for appointment to vacant positions in monasteries; but monks who had a satisfactory knowledge of the scriptures could be appointed despite lack of seniority.[2]

The monastery demanded the undivided allegiance of its incumbents. Monks were specifically forbidden to render assistance to any monastery but their own. A monk who had received his ordination in one monastery had to forego all benefit provided by that monastery and relinquish all duties connected with it before he could be a resident of another.[3] Regular residence was an essential prerequisite for the enjoyment of benefits provided by a monastery. The Mihintale Tablets specify that a monk is entitled to the income of a monastery only if he lives there.[4] The regulations in the Galvihāra inscription forbid monks to give publicity to disputes within the monastery; nor should they be subject to the jurisdiction of another monastery.[5] Violation of some of these regulations was punishable with expulsion from the monastery.

The Mihintale and the Galvihāra inscriptions contain guidance for monks for the regulation of their daily routine. They seem to have been based

[1] EZ Vol. I p.4 ll.3-5.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.40-42.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.4 ll.10-11,13-14.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.91 ll.A15-16.

[5] EZ Vol. II p. 272 l.42.

on practices current at the time and may be considered reliable sources of information on the life of monks. The Mihintale Tablets yield little information. According to this record, the monks were expected to rise early and practise the four-fold meditation - contemplation on the virtues of the Buddha, wishing for the deliverance of all beings, reflecting on the impurities of the body and contemplation on death. Then they attended to their toilet and wearing robes in the manner prescribed in the Sikkharani they proceeded to the refectory where they recited the Metta-paritta and partook of the morning meal.[1]

The directions in the Galvihāra inscription set up under the influence of the ascetic monks of the Āraññika sect prescribed a more detailed and rigorous schedule. The monks who rose at the break of dawn spent the early hours of the morning meditating on their respective topics and pacing along the promenades. This was followed by the rehearsal of the texts they had learned. After dressing up and attending to their toilet, they had to perform such chores as sweeping the compounds of the Bo-tree and the stūpa, keeping the dwellings tidy and attending on the teachers, senior monks and the sick. 'If they found it necessary', they were to go to the refectory and partake of the gruel. After breakfast, those with pressing business such as consulting books and documents, sewing and washing clothes and the distribution of priestly requisites engaged themselves in those duties. Others devoted their time to meditation. After the mid-day meal, the monks continue to engage themselves in meditation or the study of the scriptures. The eveni

[1] EZ Vol. I p.91 ll. A9-11.

was spent preaching or reading the dhamma or listening to it, discussing it or committing it to memory. It was only in the middle watch of the night that they could go to sleep.[1]

The life of monks prescribed in the Galvihāra inscription was one of rigorous application to meditation and the study of the scriptures. It is seen that the monks were obliged to perform some domestic chores. The burden this placed on monks devoted to the practice of asceticisms is a common complaint found in many texts.[2] Some would shirk their responsibilities leavin the conscientious few to do all the work and as a result these monks would have little time for their religious practices. Evidently, in the more organized monasteries, the monks were relieved of most of these chores. The Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale employed three keepers to maintain its stūpas and an attendant who kept the premises clean.[3] In addition to them, a group of employees called pahāväsi find mention in the Mihintale Tablets.[4] They occur in the inscription following the reference to the servants who worked in the kitchen. Wickremasinghe agreed with Müller and Gunasekara who translated the term as 'thatcher'.[5] On consideration of terms like veherväs and velväsi,[6] it seems preferable to trace its derivation from P. pāsādavāsi

[1] EZ Vol. II p.271 ll.A30-37.

[2] Visuddhimagga (Warren and Kosambi, 1950) pp.96-99. Sāratthadīpanī pp.560-5

[3] EZ Vol. I p.97 ll.B51-52.

[4] EZ Vol. I pp.95-96 ll.B26-27.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.110 n.1.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.195; Vol. II p.170; Vol. I V p.52.

It probably connoted 'an attendant attached to a monastic residence'. There were eleven such attendants. They received two payas of land and a daily allowance of one admanā of rice each while their supervisor received an additional pata of rice. It is possible that they were expected to perform personal services to the saṅgha and keep the dwellings in good order

In the early days, the Buddhist monk depended on voluntary donations for his food and necessities. This was not an adequate means of supporting the large number of monks concentrated at the capital. Fa-Hien who visited Ceylon at the beginning of the fifth century, recorded that he found about ten thousand monks living at Anurādhapura - five thousand at the Abhayagiri monastery, three thousand at the Mahāvihāra and two thousand at the Cetiyagiri.[2] The provision of an alms-hall, the Mahāpāḷi, where a large number of monks were fed at the king's expense was probably an attempt to improve this situation. Fa-Hien noted that five to six thousand monks were fed at this place.[3] Hiuen-tsang placed the figure at eight thousand.[4] Presumably this practice was continued after the capital was moved to Polonnaruva. For, according to the Pūjāvaliya, Parakkamabāhu I regularly provided alms for about three thousand five hundred monks.[5]

Evidently, this did not completely solve the problem. During the period under consideration, provision of food became an important function of the

---

[1] For the units of measurement, see p. 84 n.2, 91 n.6.

[2] Beal op.cit. pp. 46, 48, 49.

[3] Ibid., p.47.

[4] Ibid., p.445.

[5] Pjv. (Suravīra) p.106.

monastic organization. Gruel and boiled rice were important items in the monastic diet.[1] On occasions, monks would be treated to delicacies like sweetmeats and molasses.[2] A ninth-century inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery fixes the daily fare of monks at five upadaṁśas (cakes?), half a prastha of curd and a twentieth of a prastha of ghee.[3] Residents of certain hermitages, monks engaged in repairs to their dwellings and those entrusted with certain special responsibilities were allowed a double-share. No monk, even if he received a personal income, was entitled to a food allowance above the fixed limit.[4] A tenth-century inscription provides more information on the diet of monks. It records an endowment made to a monastery for the provision of paddy, pulse, uṅdu , sesame, red pepper, salt, betel, areca nuts and lime.[5] Monks were treated to sumptuous feasts when they were invited to alms at the houses of their wealthy patrons. Mahinda IV fed the monks of the Āraññika sect with 'abundant and costly food with various kinds of curries (vyañjana)' and provided them with sugar cooked in ghee, juice of garlic and betel as dessert. Among all monks, he distributed ghee, oil and honey.[6] Normally, the food was served in the refectory; it was only a sick monk who couldhave the food brought to his bed.[7]

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.91 l.All.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.25 ll.15, 21-22.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 4-5 ll.1-3, 19. Prastha is the synonym for pata, see p.91 n.6

[4] EZ Vol. III pp. 188-194.

[5] Cv., 54.20, 22, 24.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.91 ll.All-12.

The Mihintale Tablets reveal the detail the arrangements made for the provision of food to the saṅgha. Officials of the monastic administration were, as would be expected, entrusted with the task of overall supervision. Three of them had to be present when the raw rice was being issued from the stores and when the foodwas being served.[1] Twleve cooks were employed. Each of them received an allotment of one kiri and two payas of land. They also received a daily allowance of rice which varied according to the functions they performed: the chief cook received an admana and one pata of rice; a servant who procured fire-wood and cooked the rice, three admanās; a servant who procured fire-wood or went on errands, two admanās; and one who merely cooked the rice received only one admanā of rice. The twenty-four female servants mentioned in the list, too, were , most probably connected with the provision of food. Each of them was assigned a paya of land; the one who supervised their work received two payas. They were also entitled to an annual clothing allowance of one kaland of gold each. Two more employees - the jeṭmaṟa (lit. the chief mother) and the batge lädiyak, 'Warder of the refectory' are mentioned in this connection in the inscription it is not possible to ascertain what the duties of the former were.[2]

Robes were distributed at the end of the year. According to the Mihintale Tablets, the officials who attended to the task of the distribution of robes were entitled to one monk's share, probably the value thereof, in re-

[1] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll.A26-29.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.95 ll. B19-25.

compense.[1] It is evident from a tenth-century inscription at Anurādhapura that the robes for a monk were expected to cost three kalanḍ of gold a year.[2] This, it may be noted, was thrice the amount spent on the clothes of a femal servant. The cost of robes would, of course, vary on the type of material used to make them. The Samantapāsādikā[3] refers to robes which cost ten pieces of money and some which cost twenty. However, it is not clear whethe it is referring to kalanḍ or some other unit of currency. The information available is not sufficient to enable an estimate of the cost of maintaining a monk. At the MahāKapārārāma, one amuṇa of raw rice and four akas of gold were set apart daily for the provision of meals for its incumbents; a thousand kalanḍ of gold were spent each year on their robes.[4]

An employee termed nävi who received a vasag and a land allotment of one kiri is mentioned in the list of the Mihintale Tablets.[5] Presumably näv is the same as nāvi, 'barber', which occurs in the South Indian temple inscriptions of the same period. In the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, nävi is equated with the Pali kappaka which like nāvi denoted 'a barber'.[6] It is not possible to ascertain whether it was the monks or the monastic officials that the barber attached to the monastery was expected to serve. The practic

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.95 ll.B15-16.

[2] Slab No. 1 EZ Vol. I p.25 ll.17-19. Twenty kalanḍ of gold were set apart a a permanent endowment for the provision of robes to a monk, each year. It is clear from the inscription that the donor expected a return of fifteen per cent on his outlay. For kalanḍ see p.95.

[3] Smp. Vol. II p.358.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.48-51.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B32-33.

[6] DAG (Vimalakīrti and Somiṇda, 1960) p.81.

of employing barbers to attend on monks was not unknown in India. Hiuen-tsang refers to 'Manorhita, the doctor of the śāstras,' from Gandhāra who gave, in a fit of generosity, a hundred thousand pieces of gold to his barber.[1]

Some of the larger monasteries had hospitals to attend to the medical needs of the monks. An inscription from Mädirigiriya, dated in the tenth century, mentions a hospital (veher vedhal) attached to the monastery at the site.[2] According to the Cūlavaṃsa, the Sakkasenāpati, a courtier of Mahinda IV, built a hospital outside the city for the use of the monks.[3] A group of ruins situated at the foot of the Cetiyagiri hill at Mihintale has been identified as a hospital on the evidence from an inscription found at the site.[4] It is probably the same as the hospital which, according to the Cūlavaṃsa, Sena II built at Cetiyagiri.[5] Presumably, it was attached to the Cetiyagiri monastery. The Mihintale Tablets list a physician (vedak) who received a vasag and an allotment of dry land from Detisä among the employees of the monastery. Another, 'a physician who applied leeches' (puhuṇḍā vedak) received a vasag and two payas of land. A third called maṇḍovvak received one vasag and an allotment of one kiri and two payas of land.[6] Müller's translation of the last term as 'flower gardener' does not

[1] Beal, op.cit. p.157.

[2] EZ Vol. II pp.25-33.

[3] Cv.54.53.

[4] ARASC 1910-11 pp.19-20; 1952 p.40 no.1.

[5] Cv. 51.73.

[6] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B30-32.

seem to be appropriate;[1] arrangements made for the supply of flowers find mention elsewhere in the inscription. Wickremasinghe[2] suggested the rendering 'one who prepares medical decoctions'. The derivation of the word may be traced back to maṇḍ, 'to dress', 'to adorn' or mṛd which among other things means 'to rub'. A physician who attends to ailments of the bones and the muscles by applying ointments and massage is known in the Sinhalese villages even in modern times. It may be suggested that the maṇḍovvak was a physician who falls into this category.

In addition to these basic amenities, monks at some of the monasteries seem to have received a share of the income of the monastery. Fa-Hian refers to Indian monks receiving 'their yearly dues'.[3] I-tsing is more definite: 'The produce of the farms and gardens and the profits arising from trees and fruits are distributed annually in shares to cover the cost of clothing.[4] Probably, this practice was known in Ceylon, too. The old commentary on the Khuddasikkhā refers to the distribution among the saṅgha of the produce of land belonging to the monastery.[5] It is clear that at least those monks who shouldered special responsibilities and monks of scholarly attainments received an additional income. Emoluments were assigned to monks employed

---

[1] AIC p.119.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.110 n.4.

[3] Beal, op.cit. p.22.

[4] I-tsing p.193.

[5] Kudusikha hā purātana vistara sannaya (Sumaṅgala, 1954) p.142.

in the monastic administration. It was customary in India to proffer specia treatment to learned monks.[1] Moggallāna III assigned high incomes to schola among monks.[2] A graduated system of stipends was in force at the Cetiyagiri monastery. According to the Mihintale Tablets, the monks versed in the Vinaya Piṭaka were assigned five vasags in food and clothing; those versed in the Sutta Piṭaka received seven vasags while the monks who propounded the Abhidhamma Piṭaka received the highest stipend - twelve vasags.[3] A similar system of payment, graduated according to the field of study in which a teacher specialized, was current at the Hindu temples in South India

The interpretation of the form vasag which also occurs in connection with the emoluments paid to the lay employees of the monastery has been somewhat confused, owing to the failure to distinguish it from a similar word, vasägin. The commentary on the Kudusikha[5] used two different words, vasag and vasegini, the latter of which is most probably the same as vasägin. Vasegini occurs in place of the Pali term vassaggena, 'according to seniorit In this work, the term vasag was used in place of the Pali word bhāga, 'share'. It is also evident from this work as well as from the Vinaya-saṅgahaṭīka[6] of Sāriputta that units like 'half-share' (upaddhabhāga)and

[1] I-tsing p.30. Beal, op.cit. pp.137-138.

[2] Cv., 44.49.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.91 ll.A12-14.

[4] MRE 1918 p.146.

[5] Kudusikha p.142.

[6] Vinayasaṅgahaṭīkā (Dhammānanda) p.16.

'fourth of a share' (cūlabhāga) were known. Wickremasinghe and Perera have pointed out that certain employees received allotments of land and daily portions of rice while others received land and vasags; vasags and rice are never allotted together to the same individual. From this, it has been inferred that vasag denoted 'a measured quantity of provisions'.

The term vasag certainly denotes a quantity of food in some instances. The regulations in the Mihintale Tablets lay down that the monks who were too ill to go down to the refectory were to be served with vasags at times specified by physicians.[2] In the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, it occurs in a context where it is said that a monk should first set apart a vasag for himself if he were to offer food to a layman before partaking of it.[3] While explaining a rule on the distribution of the produce of land, the commentary on the Kudusikha states that if a monk from another monastery were to come at the time of the distribution, half of a vasag given to an inmate of the monastery may be given to him.[4] On the basis of this evidence it may be suggested that the meaning of vasag covered the portion of food or the share of the produce of land that a resident of a monastery received.

In a tenth-century inscription from Anurādhapura, a donor records the grant to the Saṅgha of both food and clothing (kanda piṇḍa) appertaining t

[1] EZ Vol. I p.83; L. S. Perera, Ancient Institutions... pp.1477-1478.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.91 ll. A11-12.

[3] DAG. p.162.

[4] See p. 213 n.5.

a vasag which he bought for two hundred kaḷand of gold.[1] The Mihintale Tablets, too, speak of food and clothing in connection with vasags. This implies that vasag included clothing as well. It is also evident from these references that vasag was a fixed allowance and that it had a cash value. It may be compared with the Tamil term paṅgu, 'share', which occurs in the contemporary records of South India. As in Ceylon, employees of religious institutions were each allocated paṅgu in return for their services. The value of a paṅgu is placed in one record at the produce of one veli of land or one hundred kalam of paddy.[2] There is no mention of a single official receiving more than one vasag. It could be suggested that the monks who received more than one vasag used this extra allowance to maintain their disciples; but this was not necessary as the monks were maintained at the expense of the monastery. Hence, it is probable that they received a cash remuneration in lieu of their extra vasags.

It seems reasonable to suggest that the life of monks at some of the larger monasteries was one of comfort; at times, it could be even luxurious The equipment provided at the monastery of Ariṭṭhapabbata was 'fit for royalty'.[3] It is doubtful, however, whether all monks had the benefits of the highly organized life that the larger monasteries provided. Aggabodhi IX (831-833 A.D.) found that monks from the smaller monasteries had to go to

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.38 ll.3-6.

[2] See SII Vol. II p.278.

[3] Cv. 50.63-64.

the Mahāvihāra for their gruel and medicine.[1] Mahinda IV was obliged sometimes to send his own physicians to attend on sick monks. He is also said to have provided the Pāṃsukūlika monks with garlic, black pepper (marica), long pepper (pipphali), ginger, sugar and the three kinds of myrobalan.[2] Presumably, these were for medical use. Monasteries usually had fixed endowments set apart for the provision of robes; but these funds were sometimes used to meet the cost of repairs.[3] Thus not all the monks were fortunate enough to get new robes at the end of the year. Kassapa IV distributed pieces of clothes for use in patching up and strengthening old robes.[4]

The ample opportunities for study that the monasteries provided, the contact with Indian centres of Buddhist scholarship and the patronage and encouragement extended by kings, some of whom were themselves scholars, stimulated scholarly activity among monks. Dāṭhānāga and Dhammamitta are the only scholars of the tenth century to find mention in the Cūlavaṃsa Unfortunately, the commentary that Dhammamitta wrote at the request of Mahinda IV has not been preserved into modern times. Ānanda, the author of the Mūlaṭīkā, whose opinions are quoted with obvious respect by later commentators, claims that his work was written at the request of a certain

[1] Cv. 49.88-90.

[2] Cv. 54.21, 23.

[3] See pp.182-183.

[4] Cv. 52. 23.

Dhammamitta.[1] The Mūlaṭīkā is a sub-commentary on Buddhaghosa's writings on the Abhidhamma. The Sāsanavaṃsa explains that it came to be known as the Mūlaṭīkā as it was the first in the series of sub-commentaries (ṭīkā) written on the Pali Canon.[2] It is certain that the Mūlaṭīkā was written before the time of Sumaṅgala, the disciple of Sāriputta; Ānanda finds mention in the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī of Sumaṅgala.[3] Malalasekara has dated Ānanda to the 'eighth or ninth century'.[4] Ānanda is listed as an Indian monk in the Gandhavaṃsa, an account of Pali literature written by a Burmese monk.[5] Though it is not possible to give an exact date, the Gandhavaṃsa is a work of late origin. It is evident from the discussion in the Mūlaṭīkā on the opinions of the Abhayagirivāsins that Ānanda was a follower of the Mahāvihāra School. It is possible that his exposition of the 'orthodox' point of view was based on commentarial sources available at the Mahāvihāra. If Dhammamitta who requested him to write this commentary is identified with the scholar of the same name who wrote a commentary on the Abhidhamma in the time of Mahinda IV, Ānanda should be dated to the tenth century. It is reasonable to expect the Mūlaṭīkā to have been written during the tenth century when both the saṅgha and the laity seem to have evinced a particular interest in works on the Abhidhamma

[1] Mūlaṭīkā (Burmese ed.) p.203.

[2] Sāsanavaṃsa (B.C. Law) p.36.

[3] See Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī (Paññāsāra and Vimaladhamma 1933) pp. 81, 108, 118.

[4] Malalasekara, Pāli literature of Ceylon, p.210.

[5] Minaev, Recherche sur le Bouddhisme p.240 (Minaev reproduces the text of the Gv. in his work.)

[6] See pp.213,331.

The statement of the Sāsanavaṃsa that the Mūlaṭīkā was the first sub-commentary would imply that the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā and the sub-commentary on the first three nikāyas of the Sutta Piṭaka were written after the time of Ānanda. The colophons of these works ascribe their authorship to a scholar or scholars by the name Dhammapāla. The Sāsanavaṃsa ascribes them to the same author and distinguishes him from the commenator of the same name who lived at Badaratittha.[1] According to its colophon, the Visaddhi-maggaṭīkā was written at the request of the thera Daṭhānāga who lived at the Siddhagāma-parivena.[2] No hermitage bearing the name Siddhagāma is mentione in the chronicles. Buddhadatta has suggested that the Siddhagāma-parivena was the same as the Sitthagāma-parivene built by Sena IV (954-956 A.D.). He goes on to suggest that Daṭhanāga should be identified with the monk of t same name who preached the Abhidhamma at the request of Mahinda IV.[3] Apart from the orthographic differences between the names of the two hermitages, the fact that the thera Daṭhanāga is not mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa as a monk of the Siddhagāma-parivena may be cited as objections against this identification. He is referred to as a monk of the 'forest-dwelling' fraternity in the chronicle. This is particularly striking as, in the preceding strophe, Dhammamitta is mentioned as a monk of the Siddhagāma-parivena.[4] However, these are not strong objections against the identifi-

[1] Sāsanavaṃsa pp. 36-7.

[2] Visuddhimaggaṭīkā (Burmese ed.), Rangoon, 1909-10, p.909.

[3] A. P. Buddhadatta, Theravādi bauddhācāryayo, 1960 pp. 54-55.

[4] Cv., 54.35-36.

cation; for it is possible that the chronicler had made a mistake. Thus the possibility that Dhammapāla, the author of the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā and the sub-commentary on the first three nikāyas of the Canon, lived in the tenth century cannot be ruled out.

According to the Gandhavaṃsa, 'Culla Dhammapāla, the senior disciple of the thera Ānanda, composed the Saccasaṅkhepa'.[1] The only monk bearing the name Ānanda in the passage which precedes this statement is the author of the Mūlaṭīkā. The Sāsanavaṃsa attributes the minor commentary (anuṭīkā) on the Mūlaṭīkā to a monk called Dhammapāla.[2] However, it is not clear whether they are identical or any one of them (or both) should be identified with the author of the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā.

One of the most notable scholars of the period under consideration was Anuruddha, the author of the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha which is perhaps the most well-known compendium of the Abhidhamma. The origin and the identity of the author have been subjects of much speculation. The brief colophon of the work comprises a benedictory verse wishing for the prosperity of a monastery called Mūlasoma;[3] presumably, it was his residence. A commentary on the Khuddasikkhā, known at present only in Burma, mentions a monastery called Mūlasoma which was in Ceylon.[4] The Talaing records, quoted by Gray,

[1] Minaev, op.cit. p.240.

[2] Sāsanavaṃsa p.37.

[3] Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahaya (Nandārāma Tissa and Dharmaratna, 1938) p.152.

[4] See A. P. Baddhadatta, Pāli sāhityaya Vol. II p.324. The prologues and the colophons of the known Pali literary works have been compiled with the author's comments in the two volumes of the Pali sāhityaya.
A tenth-century inscription from Anurādhapura mentions 'the Viraṅkurārāma monastery attached to the Mūlaso monastery'. It is possible that Mūlasoma is the same as Mūlaso; but the only monastery called Viraṅkurārāma to be mentioned in the Cv. was in the Abhayagiri monastic complex. See p.356.

place Ānanda among scholars from South India.[1] The Gandhavaṃsa lists him as an author from Ceylon and attributes the Abhidammatthasaṅgaha as well as the Nāmarūpapariccheda and the Paramatthavinichaya to him.[2] In doing so, the Gandhavaṃsa contradicts itself. The Paramatthavinicchaya was written, as evident from its colophon, by a monk from the city of Kāverī; who was living at the time of writing at Tañja in Tambaraṭṭha.[3] The colophon of the Nāmarūpapariccheda gives little information on the author but suggests that he was from the Mahāvihāra. Even early commentators like Sumaṅgala believed that all the three works were by the same author. But, as Buddhadatta has shown, the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha agrees with the Nāmarūpapariccheda but differs from the Paramatthavinicchaya on some of the views it expresses.[4] It is possible that the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha and the Nāmarūpapariccheda were written by the same person; it is also possible, however, that the authors of the three works were distinct from each other. The Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha has been dated by Malalasekara on grounds of style to the tenth or the eleventh century; others have dated it to the twelfth century.[5]

The reformative activities of Parakkamabāhu I and the revival of the

---

[1] J. Gray, Buddhaghosuppati, 1892 pp.26.

[2] Minaev, op.cit., p.245.

[3] For Tambaraṭṭha, see pp.389 ff. Paramatthavinicchaya (Devananda ed.) p.337.

[4] Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī pp. 57, 81, 88; Theravādi bauddhācaryayo, p.79.

[5] Malalasekara, op.cit. p.168; Ceyl. Hist. Jnl. Vol. IV p.91; UHC Vol. I pt. II p.585.

saṅgha under his patronage ushered in an era of fruitful scholarly activity. Kassapa of Udumbaragiri who took a leading part in reforming the saṅgha is described as a scholar who was thoroughly versed in all the three sections of the Canon and particularly in the Vinaya Piṭaka. His disciple Sāriputta calls him 'the father of the saṅgha and a specialist in the Vinaya'.[1] He was an ideal leader for this period when the most urgent need was for a revival in the standards of discipline.

Sāriputta was the leading light among the scholars of the time of Parakkamabāhu I. As a grammarian he was compared with Candra and Pāṇinī and as a poet with Kālidāsa.[2] He gathered round him a galaxy of capable students. Under his leadership, the Jetavana monastery at Polonnaruva became a great centre of learning. In the Dāthāvaṃsa composed by his disciple Dhammakitti, he is credited with the authorship of a compendium of rules of discipline called the Vinayasaṅgaha and three sub-commentaries on the Pañcikā of the grammar of Candra, on the Samantapāsādikā and on the Manorathapūraṇī, the commentary on the Aṅguttara Nikāya.[3] The Vinayasaṅgaha is also known as the Pālimuttaka vinayavinicchayasaṅgaha. His second work is not known today. Paranavitana has expressed doubts on the attribution of the Sāratthamañjūsā, the commentary on the Manorathapūraṇī, to Sāriputta.[4]

---

[1] Cv., 78.7; See also p. Sāratthadīpanī p.1.

[2] Theravādī bauddhācāryayo p.79.

[3] Dāṭhāvaṃsa (B.C.Law, 1925) pp.49-50.

[4] UHC Vol. I pt.II p.285.

But it is noteworthy that, apart from Dhammakitti, the author of the Vinayasāratthadīpanī, another disciple of Sāriputta, credits him with the authorship of this work.[1] Further, six of the verses which appear in the prologue of the Sāratthamañjūsā are also found in the prologue of the Sāratthadīpanī, the commentary on the Samantapāsādikā. Both were written at the Jetavana monastery at the request of Parakkamabāhu; and in both, the author claims that he was a discipleof the mahāthera Kassapa and the anuthera Sumedha. Hence, there is little reason to doubt that these two works were written by the same author. In addition to the four works mentioned above, Sāriputta seems to have written a commentary on his Vinayasaṅgaha and a Sinhalese gloss on the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha. In the colophon of the last work he claims to have written four other works, the Visuddhipathasaṅgaha, Kammaṭṭhānasaṅgaha, Maṅgalasuttaṭīkā and the Tilaka, a work on astrology for king Parakkamabāhu.[2]

In this connection, it is interesting that the Saddhammasaṅgaha, a work of a monk of Yodayapura (probably Ayuth'ya) who is dated to the end of the thirteenth century, records a tradition which speaks of a council of monks convened by Kassapa at the Jetavana monastery to undertake the compilation of sub-commentaries on the Canon. The author attributes the Sāratthadīpanī, Sāratthamañjūsā and the Paramatthapakāsanī, the sub-

---

[1] Pālisāhityaya Vol. II p.287.

[2] Vinayavinicchayāsarigahaṭīkā (Dhammānanda Tissa) p.151; Abhidammārtha-saṅgrahasanyaya (Paññamoli) p.195. See also Minaev, op.cit. p.241.

commentaries on the Vinaya, Sutta and the Abhidhamma Piṭakas respectively, to this council of monks headed by Kassapa.[1] If indeed such a council was held it is rather strange that it does not find mention in the Cūlavaṃsa or any of the other literary sources in Ceylon. Moreover, the colophons of the Sāratthadīpanī and the Sāratthamañjūsā as well as other contemporary sources state, as pointed out earlier, that these two works were composed by Sāriputta. However, the tradition in the Saddhammasaṅgaha may not be completely rejected. For it is possible that Sāriputta had the help of other scholars of this period in the writing of his commentaries.

Buddhanāga, the author of the Vinayatthamañjūsā, refers to Sāriputta as his teacher and states that he wrote this work at the request of Sumedha.[2] It is possible that Sumedha is the teacher of Sāriputta mentioned earlier. As evident from the references to Parakkamabāhu I in the colophon, the Vinayatthamañjūsā seems to have been written during this reign; probably, Buddhanāga was one of the senior disciples of Sāriputta.

A list of scholars who were probably junior contemporaries of Sāriputta or representatives of the generation which followed his is found in the Vinayasāratthadīpanī, written by one of his disciples. The identity of the author is withheld in the colophon; but Sumaṅgala the Araññika monk, the Coḷa monks Buddhamitta and Kassapa and the lay-scholar Dhammakitti are mentioned as his contemporaries who requested him to write this work.[3]

---

[1] Saddhammasaṅgaha (ed. Nedimāle Saddhānanda) Jnl. of the Pali Text Soc., 1890 pp. 58-61.

[2] Vinayatthamañjūsā (Burmese ed.) pp. 1, 329.

[3] Pāli sāhityaya Vol. II p.288-289.

Sumaṅgala is probably the same as the Āraññika monk of this name who requested Saṅgharakkhita to write the commentary on the Khuddasikkhā, significantly named the Sumaṅgalapasādanī, 'that which pleases Sumaṅgala'.[1] It may also be suggested that he should be identified with Sumaṅgala, the brilliant exegetist who specialized in the Abhidhamma. This monk whowas another disciple of Sāriputta wrote the Abhidhammatthavikāsinī and the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī to comment on the Abhidhammāvatāra of Buddhadatta and the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha of Anuruddha, respectively. The only difficulty in making this identification is that the former was a monk who 'constantly lived in the woods' while the latter claims to have lived at the Nandi-parivena of the Jetavanārāma.[2] Even if they were not identical, both seem to have been contemporaries of Sāriputta.

Saṅgharakkhita, who was another disciple of Sāriputta, lived at a place called Damiḷasoci (?) when he wrote the Sumaṅgalapasādanī. In the colophon of this work, he claims to have written four other books: Susaddasiddhi, Yogavinicchaya, Subodhālaṅkāra, and the Vuttodaya. Later, he wrote the Sambandhacintā on syntax. In the Vuttodaya, a work on prosody, he refers to the thera Sīla of the Selantarāyatana as his teacher.[3] Presumably, it was from this monk that he learned prosody. In the colophons

[1] Sumaṅgalapasādanī (Dangedara Sumanajoti) p.1.

[2] Abhidhammatthavikāsinī (A. P. Buddhadatta) p.456.

[3] Vuttodaya (Burmese ed.) 1898 p.123.

of both the Sumaṅgalapasādanī and the Sambandhacinta Saṅgharakkhita speaks with affection of his disciple, Medhaṅkara of the Araññavāsi fraternity who had become a famous teacher and the chief incumbent of the monastic fraternity of Udumbaragiri (Diṁbulāgala). The teacher and the disciple, it is claimed, took part in a 'purification' of the saṅgha.[1] This information is helpful in identifying and dating the two works. For, according to the Nikāyasaṅgraha,[2] a monk called Saṅgharakkhita, a disciple of Sāriputta, and another, Medhaṅkara of Diṁbulāgala took the leading part in reforming the saṅgha in the time of Vijayabāhu of Dambadeniya (1232-1236 A.D.). It also becomes evident from this that at least the Samaṅgala-pasādanī and the Sambandhacinta were written in the Daṁbadeniya Period.

The Vinayārthasamuccaya, a commentary on the Vinaya, was written, according to its colophon, by a disciple of Sāriputta and of Moggallāna, the grammarian.[3] It has been attributed to Medhaṅkara.[4] The Saddhamma-saṅgaha records that a commentary on the Saccasaṅkhepa was written by a disciple of Sāriputta.[5] The Sāsanavaṁsa attributes the Nāmarūpapariccheda, Khema, Abhidhammavatāra and the old sub-commentary on the Saccasaṅkhapa, to a certain mahāsāmi Vācissara.[6] Evidently Sāriputta had a disciple called

[1] Sumaṅgalapasādanī, p.329; Sambandhacintā (Burmese ed.) Rangoon, 1898-1900, p.95.

[2] Nikāyasaṅgrahaya (Dharmaratna, 1955) p.26.

[3] Pāli sāhityaya Vol. II pp. 528-9.

[4] Saddhammasaṅgaha, Jnl. of the Pali Text. Soc., 1890, p.64.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Sāsanavaṁsa p.37.

Vācissara. Dhammakitti, the author of the Dāthāvaṃsa has already been mentioned. This disciple of Sāriputta composed the poem on the Tooth relic in the reign of Līlāvatī.[1]

Of the Cola monks in the Vinayasāratthadīpanī, it is possible that Kassapa is identical with the monk of this name who wrote the Mohavicchedanī This work, together with the Abhidhammathavikāsinī and the Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī represent the final stage of the development of the Abhidhamma in South India and Ceylon. At the time the Mohavicchedanī was written, Kassapa was residing at Nāgñana monastery in Colādhināthapura.[2] A monk from the Damila country called Kassapa finds mention in the Sāsanavaṃsa as having written the Vimativinodanī.[3] He occurs after Sāriputta. The Gandhavaṃsaaṃsa attributes four works - the Mohavicchedanī, Vimaticchedanī, Buddhavaṃsa and the Anāgatavaṃsa to a monk named Kassapa.[4] It is possible that Vimaticchedanī is a corrupt form of Vimativinodanī. Probably the Vimativinodanī and the Mohavicchedanī are works of the same author. No information is available on Buddahamitta, the other Cola monk. The lay scholar Dhammakitti could be the same as the pandita Dhammakitti who was one of the Sinhalese envoys at the Burmese court in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.[5] A lay scholar by the same name finds mention in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, tc

[1] Dāthāvaṃsa p.4 v.6.

[2] Mohavicchedani (PTS) p.359.

[3] Sāsanavaṃsa p.37.

[4] Minaev op.cit. p.240.

[5] Cv., 76.32.

[6] Niks. p.28.

It is evident from the preceding discussion that the literary activities of the period under consideration were dominated by exegetic scholarship. The role of the scholars was one of explaining the scriptures and their commentaries, critically examining the interpretations given by their predecessors and systematically presenting the teachings of the Theravāda school. Yet, there is reason to believe that the knowledge of at least some of the monks was not restricted to the teachings of the Theravāda school. It has been pointed out elsewhere that special provision was made at the Abhayagiri monastery for the study of treatises of the non-Theravāda schools.[1] Mugalan, who was the chief incumbent of the Uturuḷamuḷa in the time of Vijayabāhu I, is described as a scholar versed in the āgamas and the śāstras.[2] In his inscription at Daṃbulla, Nissaṅka Malla claims to have promoted the study of the scriptures and 'other extraneous śāstras' among monks.[3] Kassapa, the Coḷa monk who wrote the Mohavicchedanī, describes himself as a man versed in the satthantaras (śāstrāntaras).[4] Presumably, this is synonymous with 'the extraneous śāstras (bāhiraśāstra)' mentioned above. Together they could refer either to non-Theravāda teachings or to the secular branches of knowledge. It is more probable that it connoted the latter. In the Dāṭhavaṃsa, Sāriputta is described as a teacher of

[1] See p.312.

[2] EI Vol. XVIII p.337 ll.25-26.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 131-132 ll.21-22.

[4] Mohavicchedanī p.359.

all the śāstras and a scholar thoroughly versed in the non-Theravāda doctrines.[1] The Vinayasāratthadīpani refers to him as a monk learned in astrology (jotisattha) and the satthantaras.[2] As mentioned earlier, Sāriputta claims tohave written a work on astrology.

A broad liberal education was considered an essential requisite for monks. It would equip them intellectually to defeat their rivals in debate. It could also help them to secure a broad-based support among the laity. This idea occurs in the chronicle of Bu-ston where he comments on a verse from the Sūtrālaṅkāra:[3]

> 'In order to vanquish and to help others as well as to obtain knowledge through knowledge of himself, he (the good monk) is earnestly applied to study .... Accordingly the science of Logic (hetuvidyā) and of Grammar and Literature are studied in order to vanquish adversaries (in controversy); the science of Medicine (cikitsāvidya) and Arts (śilpakarmavidyā) for administering help to others, and that of Metaphysics (adhyātmavidyā) to acquire knowledge himself.'

It is possible that similar intentions encouraged the Sinhalese monk to acquire a knowledge in the secular fields of study. One field of interest was grammar. The commentary of Sāriputta on the Cāndravyākarana and the Sambandhacintā of Saṅgharakkhita have already been mentioned. The Rūpasiddhi was written by Buddhappiya, a Cola monk who studied under a Sinhalese monk.[4] Moggallāna, a monk from Anurādhapura who wrote the

---

[1] Daṭhāvaṃsa pp. 49-50.

[2] Pāli sāhityaya Vol. II p.287.

[3] Sūtrālaṅkāra (Huber, 1908) pp. 311-312. Bu-ston, The history of Buddhism in India and Tibet (Obermiller, 1932) Vol. I p.44.

[4] Mahārūpasiddhisannaya (Sumaṅgala and Dhammaratana) p.444.

Moggallāyanavyākaraṇa lived in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.[1] In the Vinayārthasamuccaya[2] Medhaṅkara refers to Moggallāna and Sāriputta as his teachers. Piyadassi who composed the Padasādhana based on the Moggallāyanavyākaraṇa was another student of Moggallāna.[3] These two works started a new school of Pali grammar. The grammarian seems to have been different from Moggallāna of the Sarogāmamūla who composed the lexicon, the Abhidhānappadīpikā, in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.[4]

The Vuttodaya and the Subodhālaṅkāra of Saṅgharakkhita are works on prosody and poetics. It would be natural to expect that the interest of the monks in literary activities would spill over the limits of purely technical studies on to actual attempts at versification. Owing to the dictates of the disciplinary rules, they had to deal with 'approved' subjects like the personality of the Buddha. Exercises in metrical construction in praise of the Buddha like the Jinālaṅkāra of Buddharakkhita and the Pajjamadhu of Buddhappiya are typical products of such a situation. Yet, it was not always that the poetic talents of monks were restrained by disciplinary rules. Paranavitana's comments on the graffiti scribbled by monks who visited Sīgiri are revealing: '... it is very rarely that the subject-matter of their verses proclaims them to be the compositions of those who adopted thereligious life. Most of the clerics had entered.

---

[1] Pāli sāhityaya Vol. II p.512.

[2] Ibid., pp. 528-529.

[3] Padasādhana (Dharmānanda) pp. 302-303.

[4] Abhidhānappadīpikā (Toṭagamuve Paññātissa 1895) p.161.

into the spirit of the occasion, and addressed the ladies in a manner far from sermonizing. One of them, for instance, addressing a lady in the painting, expounds the doctrine that an occasional lapse from virtue in one who is generally of good conduct may be condoned.'[1]

The widening of the intellectual horizon of monks is reflected in the interest they showed in the study of Sanskrit. Though the knowledge of Sanskrit would have been common even in the earlier periods, Sanskrit does not seem to have occupied an important place in monastic education. Sinhalese and particularly Pali were the media of intellectual activity. The interest in the teachings of the non-Theravāda schools of Buddhism was one of the factors which induced monks to study Sanskrit. Most of the inscriptions which testify to the prevalence of Mahāyāna and Tāntric practices in Ceylon are in Sanskrit. These records which are in the Pallava Grantha, Kuṭila or the Sinhalese script reveal a close acquaintance with the language, a high standard of learning and a remarkable ability at metrical construction.[2] As a result, Sanskrit studies seem to have become popular in Ceylon at a time Sanskrit literature was in decadence in India.

The interest that the monks took in the study of Sanskrit is evident from the grammatical works written during this period. In addition to the Bālāvabodhana attributed to Kassapa of Udumbaragiri, the commentary

---

[1] S, Paranavitana, Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. I p.ccxiv.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.157-164, 219-235; Vol. V Pt. I pp. 168-169.

that Sāriputta wrote on the Pañcikālaṅkāra dates from this period. Paranavitana has suggested that Buddhanāga, the author of another exegetical work on Sanskrit grammar, should be identified with the disciple of Sāriputta who bore this name.[1] The Cūlavaṃsa, in describing the network of espionage organized by Parakkamabāhu I, refers to spies versed in the Itihāsa, Purāṇas and the Āgamas who went in the guise of monks.[2] This may give an idea of the knowledge that the monks were expected to possess. The author of the Cūlavaṃsa himself reveals his knowledge of tales in the epics and legends about persons like Duśyanta and Cāṇakya in his account of the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.[3]

The progress in literary activity that the monks achieved during the period owed much to the patronage extended by the kings. The Cūlavaṃsa records that Udaya I gave bronze alms-bowls to monks who studied hard.[4] Many of the literary works of the Polonnaruva Period make grateful mention of the generous patronage of Parakkamabāhu I; some of them were written at his special request. This patronage was continued by Nissaṅka Malla who, according to his inscriptions, provided facilities for the expansion of learning.[5]

It was Sāriputta and the many scholars who studied at his feet who brought about a revival in Buddhist scholastic activity and produced

---

[1] UHC Vol. I pt. II p.588.

[2] Cv. 66.143-145.

[3] Cv. 64.42-45.

[4] Cv. 49.34.

[5] See p.287.

the greater majority of the Pali literary works of the period under review. But the Pali literature of this period was not the exclusive contribution of the Ceylonese; nor had it been so in the period which preceded. Many monks from South India, and in later times from Burma, occur in the lists of Pali scholars. In fact, some of the most eminent writers came from South India. Some of them studied under Sinhalese monks. In some other cases, they occur as the contemporaries who persuaded Sinhalese monks to write their works. Together, they seem to have worked in fruitful collaboration to annotate and systematically present the teachings of the Theravāda - particularly of the Mahāvihāra school.

The acquaintance of the clerics with the belles lettres and their interest in scholarly pursuits in secular branches of knowledge turned the monastery into a centre of literary education. The monks, as the literati of the society, were in a position to impart knowledge in various fields to the layman. I-tsing who visited India in the seventh century noted that the Indian monks of the time performed this function: 'In the monasteries of India, there are many students who are entrusted to the Bhikṣus and instructed by them in secular literature.'[1]

If the testimony of the Cūlavaṃsa is to be accepted, the education of the young prince Parakkamabāhu included the study of the Buddhist scriptures, grammar (saddasattha), poetics (kāveyya), lexicography (nighaṇḍu), works on ritual (keṭubha)[2] and writings on statecraft (nīti)

---

[1] I-tsing pp. 105-106.

[2] Buddhaghosa defines keṭubha as 'the science which assists the officiating priests by laying down rules for the rites, or by leaving them to their direction'. See PTS Pali Dictionary; Sumaṅgalavilāsinī Vol. I p.247.

like the treatise of Koṭalla (Skt. Kauṭilya), in addition to training in dance and song, the use of weapons like the bow and the sword and the handling of elephants.[1] Even if this account is not creditworthy, it at least represents the ideal. It is noteworthy that in this list the study of the Buddhist teachings is given a prominent place. Apart from this, the monks of this period would have been in a position to teach such subjects as grammar, poetics and lexicography. In an earlier instance, the Cūlavaṃsa mentions that Dhātusena learned statecraft (nīti) from a monk who was his uncle.[2] The monasteries of Ceylon, like the Hindu temples of South India, employed laymen as teachers, possibly to teach those secular subjects which the monks were required by their disciplinary rules to refrain from learning or teaching. The Catiyagiri monastery at Mihintale had lay teachers (ädura damin) in its pay-roll. Six men, some of whom were teachers and some preachers (baṇavajārama damin), were alloted the dues from the village Gutāgama.[3]

It would be an exaggeration, however, to maintain, as Rāhula has done, that 'thewhole system of education, both eccleciastical and lay, was in the hands of the saṅgha' and that the monks of Ceylon took 'into their hands the education of the whole nation'.[4] The concepts of education covered a wide field to include the cultivation of skills in many fields

---

[1] Cv., 64.3-4.

[2] Cv. 38.21. This passage, however, is not very reliable; it is merely a conjectural reading.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll. B38-39.

[4] Rāhula, op.cit. p.287.

in addition to the acquisition of literary learning. It is most unlikely that the monks or the teachers employed at the monasteries taught such skills as the handling of weapons. Evenliterary learning would not have been the monopoly of monks. The Cūlavaṃsa refers to men who taught youths the art of writing and the skill in handling weapons.[1] It is reasonable to expect that the Brāhmaṇas, too, occupied an important place as teachers at a time when the study of Sanskrit and subjects like ketubha were popular.

This does not deny that the monastery played a prominent role in the educational set-up in Ceylon. Their control over education gave the saṅgha an opportunity to come into contact with and to influence royalty, the official classes and the literati. The cultured laity showed an interest in learning the Buddhist scriptures. Laymen versed in the Buddhist teachings were sometimes employed by monasteries to work as preachers.[2] The contact with the gentry won for the saṅgha an influential body of patrons. In the reign of Kassapa IV, the high officials of the court surpassed the king intheir munificentpatronage of the saṅgha.[3]

This contact also resulted in the percolation of Buddhist influence into the secular fields of intellectual activity. For one, Buddhism had a discouraging influence on the study of the Sanskrit epics. Several of the Buddhist works state that the study of the Mahābhārata and the Sītahārana

---

[1] Cv. 66.138.

[2] See p.233.

[3] Cv. 52.16-34.

(Rāmāyaṇa) is a fruitless wastage of time.[1] Despite this, works like the Cūlavaṃsa reveal a knowledge of the epics.[2] But unlike in the case of literature of India and other countries influenced by Indian culture, no work directly based on the epics is found in Ceylon. On the other hand, the known literary works, paintings and sculpture draw their inspiration almost exclusively from Buddhist sources. In fact, this is one of the significant characteristics which have given the Island an individuality in culture distinct from the other sub-cultures of South Asia.

A detailed assessment of the influence of Buddhism on the Sinhalese society is a task fraught with many difficulties. For Buddhism existed side by side and was to some extent intermixed with other religions and cults. Sometimes more than one religion could work in collaboration to propagate certain common ideas. The idea of ahiṃsā may be cited as one such example. Aggabodhi VIII forbade the bringing of fish, meat or intoxicating drinks to the city centre on the uposatha days which are of religious significance to the Buddhists.[3] Nissaṅka Malla went to the extent of ordering that no animals should be killed within a distance of seven gavu from the capital. The 'twelve great tanks' were turned into sanctuaries for the fish. Fowlers were persuaded with gifts of wealth to give up killing of birds. This is recorded in an inscription found at a Buddhist

---

[1] Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (PTS) Vol. I p.76.
Papañcasūdani (PTS) Vol. I p.163.
Amāvatura (Ñāṇaloka, 1959), p.93.

[2] See p.231.

[3] Cv. 49.48.

shrine - the Ruvanvälisäya.[1] Ostensibly, it would appear that it was the influence of Buddhism which persuaded these kings to enforce the practice of ahimsā. But it is noteworthy that in the Sinhalese society the eating of beef was considered particularly repugnant. The Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya explains the term bherivādakakula as one denoting a caste of people who played the drums and were used to eating beef.[2] Presumably, taking beef was considered to be an abominable practice confined to the low castes. Certain Sinhalese edicts of this period carry the warning that a person who violates the rules laid down therein would take upon himself the sins committed by the eḷumaruvā of Mahavoṭiya (Māntai). The word eḷu would normally mean 'goats'. Paranavitana takes it as eḷa and translates the term as 'killer of cows'.[3] A well-known Śaiva shrine was found at this time at Māntai.[4] It is possible, therefore, that the killing of cows at Mantai was considered to be a grievous sin - even by the Buddhists. The sanctions against the eating of beef which existed in the Sinhalese society would suggest that the idea of ahimsā was not the sole contribution of Buddhism; it reflects the influence of Hinduism - particularly of the Śaiva variety. This is a clear instance which illustrates the collaboration of Buddhist and Hindu influences in the propagation of common ideas within the Sinhalese

[1] EZ Vol. II p.80 ll.26-28. Also EZ Vol. II p.140 ll.A23-33.

[2] ...bherivādakakula, beravākulehi, gerimas kat nam bera gasat nam ū beravayoyi.... JAG (Jayatilaka), p.74.

[3] EZ Vol. III p.225 n.8.

[4] See e.g. Tirunāṇa - campantar Tēvārat - Tiruppatikaṅkal, Tiru-murai - 2, Patikam - 243 Kalakam pp. 518-520.

society.

The influential position that the monks held in the society suited them to the role of mediators among kings as well as commoners. They were the advisors who enjoyed the respect and confidence of the laity. It was thus possible for them to intervene and settle disputes among laymen. This is reflected in an inscription from Koṭṭāṅge dated to the reign of Lokeśvara. This inscription records the grant of land to a layman and specifies that all disputes regarding it were to be referred to the chief incumbent of a monastery in the vicinity.[1]

Apart from the religious and economic ties which linked the monastery with the lay society, there were also the kinship ties which brought the individual monk close to lay families. The responsibility of a monk towards his parents is acknowledged even in the Vinaya.[2] Enthusiastic patrons went to the extent of patronizing the kinsmen of the monks they respected. Kassapa V distributed rice and clothing among the mothers of the Pāṃsukūlika monks.[3] Vijayabāhu I granted 'maintenance villages' to the relatives of monks who practised ascetisism.[4] These instances may indicate that the admission of a person into the Order of monks brought social recognition to his family. But it is more probable that it reflects the failure of monks to completely sever the ties and obligations which bound them to their

[1] EZ Vol. IV p.87 ll.10-13.

[2] Vinaya Piṭaka Vol. I pp. 147-8, 297-8.

[3] Cv., 52.27.

[4] Cv., 60.69.

kinship groups. Sometimes, these obligations would have proved to be burdens which hindered the monks in the pursuance of their religious life. Nissaṅka Malla bestowed wealth on the kinsmen of monks to relieve 'the reverend and virtuous monks' of such obligations.[1] It is possible that some monks tried to secure posts in the monastic administration for their kinsmen. The Mihintale Tablets forbid monks, on pain of expulsion from the monastery, to give control over monastic property to their kinsmen. If any relative of a monk were to be found occupying a post in the administration he was to be dismissed forthwith.[2] According to a ninth-century inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery, no monk whose relatives lived in a monastic village was to be allowed to live at the monastery concerned.[3] Presumably, kinship ties prevailed even between monks. Most probably, it is to discourage this that the Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V decrees that four or more monks who were kinsmen should not live together at the same monastic residence.[4]

The close relations the monks maintained with their kinsmen would have made it difficult for them to dissociate themselves from the social strata of their lay life. At least the monks from the upper rungs of the caste system would not have been too keen to forget their status. The Cola

[1] EZ Vol. II p.79 ll.18-19.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp.91-92 ll. A18-19, 24-25.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.26-27.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.39-40.

monk Kassapa mentions in his Mohavicchedanī that he was a Brāḥmana by caste.[1] In works by Sinhalese monks of the period under consideration, no specific mention of caste is found though they claim 'purity in descent'.[2] It is possible that in Ceylon social stratification was not as rigid as it was in South India. Yet, as pointed out elsewhere, it is important to note that distinctions of birth and office were recognized and given expression in the organization of Buddhist ritual and even the administration of monasteries.[3] In an early thirteenth-century inscription from Koṭṭaṅge, a monk refers to his descent from a person who was 'like unto an ornament of the Lamāṇi (Lambakaṇṇa) clan'.[4] More definite references to the caste and clan identities of monks are found in the Dambadeniya Period.[5] It is interesting that the author of the Pūjāvaliya who states in the earlier part of the book that monks lose their caste identity on entering the Order, lays claim in the colophon to 'unmixed descent on both sides from the Mahāpaṅḍivaṃśa of the Gaṇavāsikula'.[6] Nevertheless, we need not doubt that all monks, irrespective of their social origins, were placed above the laity in the social order of the day.

---

[1] Mohavicchedanī p.359.

[2] Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. II p.379, 509.

[3] See p.347.

[4] EZ Vol. IV pp. 89-90 ll.4-5.

[5] Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. II pp. 547, 382.

[6] Pjv. (Benoṭṭa Saddhātissa) pp. 6, 754.

THE SAṄGHA AND THE KING

The Buddhist tradition placed great emphasis on the importance of the king as the leader of men. People follow their king, one of the stories in the Jātaka collection states, just as naturally as a herd of kine would follow the leading bull along paths devious or direct.[1] The stability of the social system as well as the proper functioning of the whole universe depend on the conduct of the king.[2] Like the Buddha himself, the Cakkavatti, the ideal Buddhist king, possessed the thirty-two physical characteristics of a "great man" (mahāpurisa). Similar rites should be performed at the funerals of a Cakkavatti and a Buddha. It was proper to build a stūpa to commemorate a Cakkavatti.[3] Some of these ideas echo in the chronicles of Ceylon: "Many people besides erected these and other vihāras, emulating the king: for it is the rule with living creatures: what he who is master does, evil or good, the same is done by his subjects."[4] The Cūlavaṃsa also mentions that in the reign of the just king Sena IV, the gods always sent rain in the correct season.[5]

An attitude of close co-operation with the temporal authorities is evident among the saṅgha from the earliest days of its history. The Buddha advised the monks to obey the king.[6] The rules in the Vinaya Piṭaka which

[1] Ummadantī Jātaka, Fausböll, The Jātaka, Vol. V, 1891, p. 222 vv. 48-51.

[2] Aṅguttara Nikāya (PTS) Vol. II, 1888, pp.74-76.

[3] Ibid. Vol. I, 1885, pp. 76-77; Dīgha Nikāya (PTS) Vol. II, 1903, pp. 142-43 Vol. III pp. 58-80.

[4] Cv., 46.25-26.

[5] Cv., 54.3.

[6] Vinaya Piṭaka ([redacted]) Vol. I, 1879, p.138.

forbid the admission into the Order of the employees of the king and men wanted by the law also reflect the deference shown by the community of monks for the interests of the state.[1] The kings were equally considerate. Bimbisāra declared that monks were immune from punishment.[2]

In Ceylon, this relationship developed into a very close association between the king and the saṅgha. It is possible that the excesses committed by Mahāsena during his persecution of the Mahāvihāra brought about a change of attitude. While commenting on the injunction of the Buddha to obey the king, Buddhaghosa introduces a proviso: "The king may be obeyed as regards righteous acts; but in cases of unrighteousness, no one, whoever it may be, should be obeyed."[3] Apart from certain exceptions, kings of Ceylon from the time of Devānaṃpiyatissa were ardent patrons of the saṅgha. It is possible that the influence the monks wielded over the people was considered factor which could be utilized to help consolidate the position of the king.

The belief that Ceylon was a favoured land with a special relationship with Buddhism is evident in the legends in the earliest chronicles of the Island like the Dīpavaṃsa and the Mahāvaṃsa. According to these chronicles, the Buddha had visited the Island three times. It was he who made it fit for human habitation by driving its former inhabitants, the yakkhas, away. He sanctified by his presence the places where the important shrines of the Island were to be built later on. Even his last thoughts were

---

[1] Vinaya Piṭaka ([redacted]) Vol. I, 1879, pp. 73-76.

[2] Ibid., p.76.

[3] aññasmiṃ ca dhammike kamme anuvattitabbaṃ, adhammike pana na kassaci anuvattitabbanti. Smp. Vol. VI p.1068.

concerned with the welfare of the Island. This idea is developed further in the later records. According to the inscriptions of Nissaṅka Malla, the establishment of Buddhism in Ceylon has made it a noble land; in fact, the Island belongs to the Buddhist sāsana.[1]

A natural development from these beliefs was the idea that the king of the Island should be a Buddhist. The Pūjāvaliya and the Saddharmālaṅkāra, dating respectively from the thirteenth and the fourteenth century, maintain that the Island is suited only for kings of the true faith. The power of the Buddha is such, they add, that no non-Buddhist dynasty would be able to consolidate their authority even if they were to usurp the throne by force.[2]

It is not possible to trace such a categoric statement of this idea to an earlier work; but there is strong evidence which suggests that it was known in earlier times. The ceremony of the consecration of the king evinces a distinct Buddhist character.[3] The association of the king with the cult of Buddhist relics - particularly the Tooth and Bowl relics - also points to the same direction.[4] When the Tooth relic was brought to Ceylon in the reign of Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328 A.D.) it was housed in a shrine close to the palace. Fa-Hian reports that it was kept in a shrine within the city.[5] According to Hiuen-tsang, the shrine was by the side of the palace.[6] An

---

[1] EZ Vol II p.113 l.C.3-4; p.161 ll.B8-10.

[2] Pjv. p.49; Saddharmālaṅkāra (Bentoṭa Saddhātissa, 1934), p.393.

[3] See p.249 n.2.

[4] See also pp.327 ff.

[5] Beal, Chinese accounts of India p.48.

[6] Ibid. p.443.

inscription found within the citadel of Anurādhapura helps to identify the site of the shrine.[1] When the capital was shifted to Polonnaruva, Vijayabāhu I built a temple of the Tooth within the citadel of the new capital.[2] Mānābharaṇa took the two relics - the Tooth and the Bowl - from Rohaṇa to Polonnaruva after his capture of the capital.[3] Perhaps, he expected it would help him attract popular support to his cause. In the campaigns of Parakkamabāhu I against Sugalā, great importance was attached to the capture of these relics. Immediately after their capture, they were sent to Parakkamabāhu to be housed in a shrine in the centre of the city.[4] As Geiger pointed out,[5] these relics had come to constitute, by this time, the national palladium, the symbols of legitimate kingship.

Clearer evidence is found in an inscription from the precincts of the Abhayagiri monastery, dated in the reign of a king identified as Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.). In this record, the king speaks of the rulers of his dynasty as "the kṣatriya lords devoted to the Buddha, who of yore have received the assurance made by the Omniscient Lord of Sages, the pinnacle of the Śākya clan, that none but Bodhisattvas would become kings of prosperous Laṅkā."[6] It would thus seem that kings of Ceylon had not only to be Buddhists; they had to be Bodhisattvas - men destined to be Buddhas.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 113-120. The identification suggested by Wickremasinghe is wrong. See ARASC 1897 p.3.

[2] Cv., 60.16; EI Vol. XVIII p.337 ll.17-22.

[3] Cv., 70.265-266.

[4] Cv., 74.83 et seq.

[5] CCMT p.214.

[6] nobōsathu norajvanhayi sänäkula kot savaniya munirajhu (viyāraṇ) lad EZ Vol. I p.237 ll.52-53. See also p.240.

It would also follow from this statement in the inscription that all those who became king were indeed Bodhisattvas. The elevation of the king to the highest position that a layman could aspire to in the Buddhist social order represents an advanced stage in the development of the concept of kingship in Ceylon. It is noteworthy that this inscription was found within the grounds of a monastery. In acquiescing, in this idea, the saṅgha recognized the king as the leader of the laity in the political as well as the religious field. This, of course, does not mean that all kings were considered to be Bodhisattvas during their reigns . It is not possible to ascertain chronologically how far the implications of the statements in this inscription are applicable though it is clear that this idea, in its germinal form, goes back to a very early period.

The term mahāsattva, used as an epithet of Bodhisattvas, is applied in the Mahāvaṃsa[1] to Sirisaṅghabodhi who ruled in the third century and was considered to be a paragon of virtue and a zealous patron of the faith. The name of this king was used alternatively with Salamevan Abhaya as a title by the kings of our period. Buddhadāsa (337-365) led the life of a Bodhisattva.[2] Upatissa II (517-518) practised the ten pāramitās.[3] Similarly, both Aggabodhi I (571-604) and Sena I (833-853) are said to have aspired to Buddhahood.[4] Aggabodhi IV (667-683) was considered so 'holy' that his

---

[1] Mv., 36.90.

[2] Cv., 37.109.

[3] Cv., 37.180.

[4] aggabodhigatāsayo Cv.42.1: buddhabhūmigatāsayo Cv., 50.65.

superstitious subjects used ashes from his pyre as medicine.[1] Mahinda IV claims in an inscription to have "secured for himself the way to Nirvāna".[2] It is true that the evidence in these sources refers to a few individual kings being called Bodhisattvas and that this does not necessarily amount to an enhancement of the position of kingship. These 'holy kings', however, would have made the elevation of kingship to the highest position among the laity in the Buddhist social order an easier task.

In addition to this, the dynasty which ruled the Island during the period under consideration laid claims to a close personal relationship with the Buddha. The tradition which was basic to this claim is found in the Dīpavaṃsa and the Mahāvaṃsa which trace back the genealogy of king Paṇḍukābhaya to the Śākya Amitodana, a brother of Suddhodana. Yet, no evidence is available till the tenth century of an actual instance of a king having claimed to be a descendant of the Śākya clan. Such a claim occurs for the first time in a record dated to the third year of Kassapa V, who was one of the most prominent scholars of his time. In this record, Kassapa claims descent from the line of Okāvas (P. Okkāka).[3] There is little doubt that this ancestor is the same as Okkāka who occurs in the Mahāvaṃsa as a king of the Śākya clan.[4] This claim occurs in stereotyped form in the records of the successors of Kassapa V. In the reign of Dappula IV(V) (924-935)

[1] Cv., 46.37.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 32-37 ll.3-4, p.34.

[3] Mādirigiriya pillar inscription EZ Vol. II pp.25-33.

[4] Mv., 2.11-12.

a certain Lämäni Mihindu claims to be a descendant of king Paḍu Abhā (Paṇḍukābaya) and to be 'the incomparable ornament of the Sähä clan'.[1] It occurs in greater detail in a fragmentary slab inscription from the Jetavana monastery issued in the seventh year of a king identified as Mahinda IV (956-972). In this record Mahinda is described as 'the pinnacle of the illustrious Sähā clan, who is descended from the lineage of Okāvas, who has come down in the succession of the great king Sudovun and who is descended from the lineage of the great king Paḍuvasdev Abhā'.[2] Descent from Suddhodana is claimed in two more records - the Polonnaruva pillar inscription of Mahinda V and the Dimbulāgala inscription of the queen of Vikkamabāhu I.[3] This was not a claim which strictly conformed to the traditions in the chronicles which maintain that Paṇḍukābhaya was a descendant of the line of Amitodana. Yet, it was a claim which legitimised the rights of the Sinhalese kings by presenting them as the direct descendants of the line of the Buddha. It was but fit and proper that 'the descendants of the line of the Buddha' should rule the land which 'belonged to the sāsana'.

In the Badulla inscription of Udaya IV (946-954), a predecessor of the king (Kassapa IV?) is referred to as satalosa pirinivivan vahanse, 'the lord who entered the parinirvāṇa in the sixteenth (regnal) year'.[4] The word pirinivi was, under normal circumstances, strictly reserved to denote

[1] EZ., Vol. III pp.222-233. Paḍu Abhā naranindhu paraparen ā Sähä kulaṭ ektalā ṭikvä siṭi.

[2] Siribar Sähäkulaṭ kot Okāvas/ parapure/n baṭ Sudovun maharajhu anva/ye/n a Paḍuvasdev Abha maharajhu parapuren baṭ EZ Vol. III p.227 ll.1-4. See also p.228. I have changed 'Sähä race' in Paranavitana's translatinn to 'Sähä clan'.

[3] EZ Vol. IV p.64 ll.A12-14; Vol. II p.95 l.1.

[4] EZ Vol. V Pt. II p.185 ll.A23-24.

the demise of a Buddha or an Arahant - beings in their last birth. It is significant that the phrase bears a striking similarity to the posthumous title of Sūryavarman I (1002-1050). It is quite probable that the Cambodian king was called nirvāṇapada after his death in accordance with the traditions of apotheosis known in his country.[1] It is tempting to suggest that the similarity of these titles indicates a parallel attempt to elevate the institution of kingship to a position of equality with the highest ranks of the Buddhist Order. On the other hand, it is also possible, as Paranavitana has suggested, that this was merely the most respectful way the scribe knew of expressing the death of the king.[2] It is remarkable, however, that a term which was usually reserved for Buddhas and Arahants was used, in this case, to refer to a king.

Evidence of a similar nature is found in an inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery, datable to the tenth century on palaeographic grounds.[3] The king who set up this record claims that he erected a golden image of the Buddha at the Bul Atulā monastery. The image is described as tamā palaṅgi.[4] The word palaṅga occurs in the sense of 'proportion' or 'size' in the Vesaturudā sanne and the Butsaraṇa.[5] It occurs three times in the Siya baslakara, a work contemporaneous with the inscription. In one of these

[1] Coedès, Les états hindouisés.....pp. 224, 249.

[2] EZ Vol. III pp.86-87.

[3] Wickremasinghe identified the king mentioned in this record with Mahinda IV; but this is not quite certain.

[4] (Bu)l Atulā veherhi suvan muvā tamā pa(laṅgi) munind pilibib karā EZ., Vol. I p.223 l.35.

[5] Vesaturudā sanne (Hettiaracci) p.415; Butsaraṇa (Sorata) p.270.

contexts, the word means 'similar'.[1] In the other two itseems to carry a stronger shade of meaning.[2] If the passage inour inscription is interpreted on this basis, it seems to reveal that the king in question erected a Buddha image which bore his own physical features or which conformed to his proportions. The practice of erecting portrait statues of kings in the form of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas was common in South East Asia.[3] It was a means of identifying the king with the higher divinities of the Buddhist pantheon or with the Buddhas themselves. But the erection of a statue conforming to the features of the king does not necessarily indicate that an attempt was being made to identify the king with the Buddha. Further, it is not possible to be certain of the reading of the relevant passage as the inscription is not well preserved.

The idea that the king was almost an equal of the Buddha is quite consistent with the Theravāda tradition. Possibly, it is a claim for such a recognition that is found in the Northern Gateway inscription of Nissaṅka Malla which states that 'to get an impartial king is like getting a Buddha'.[4] The obsequies performed at the death of Vijahabāhu III (1232-1236) also suggest that the king was treated like a religious dignitary; the cremation of his body was carried out within the precincts of a monastery and a stūpa was erected on the site of the pyre.[5]

---

[1] Siyabaslakara (Ñāṇātiloka and Ñāṇasīha), 1933, p.7 v.81.

[2] Ibid., p.8 v.87.

[3] Coedès, 'Note sur l'apothéose au Cambodge', Bulletin de la Commission Archèologique de l'Indochine, Paris, 1911, pp. 38-50. Les états hindouisés..... pp. 315, 33, 386.

[4] EZ Vol. II p.109 ll.C5-7.

[5] Hvv., p.32.

The position of kingship was further strengthened by the claim that it was the saṅgha who vested the king with his authority. This added religious sanction to political authority. The rulers of the Island, according to the inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery cited above, were 'wont to don the white scarf to serve and attend the great community of monks on the very day they celebrate the coronation-festival after attaining to the dignity of kingship bestowed by the great community of monks for the purpose of defending their bowls and robes'.[1] Two facts emerge from this statement: Firstly, it becomes clear that kingship was supposed to have been given by the saṅgha. As mentioned earlier, the ceremony of the consecration of the king described in the Vaṃsatthapakāsinī evinces a distinct Buddhist character. It is stated in this work that the vessels used for the ceremony were made from clay obtained from seven places, five of which were certainly of religious significance.[2] Apparently, there was another rite connected with the investiture of the king by the saṅgha performed on the same day as the coronation. Secondly, this passage indicates that the protectionof the saṅgha and their possessions was considered to be the expres

[1] tumā pay sivur rak(nuvas) mahasaṅghu pilivāyū rajsiri päminä sänä bisev vindna (da)vas saṇghaṭ meheyaṭ uvasarvas (sevel) bandna EZ., Vol. I p.237 11.53-55. Wickremasinghe translates tumā pay sivur as "the bowl and robe of the Buddha'. EZ Vol. I p.240. This is inaccurate.

[2] The clay for the ceremony was obtained from beneath the northern flights of steps of the Mahābodhighara, Nīla pond, Lohapāsāda, Pagonupamālaka, and the Mahācetiya and from beneath the northern doorways of the Catussālā and the Cīvaraparupanaṭṭhāna-samujjanasālā. Vap. Vol. I p.307. Rahula states that Sena II received his coronation at the Mahācetiya (History of Buddhism in Ceylon p.71). This seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the word abhiseke in Cv. 51.82. If we take this word as referring to a coronation, as Rahula has done, it involves the implication that the coronation was held annually. Obviously, this is not a likely possibility. Abhiseka in this strophe seems to be the same as udakaseka in the preceding strophe. Cv. 51.8 Evidently, it was a part of the rites pertaining to the image of Ānanda, performed to ward off illness. For a discussion on these rites, see p.325.

duty of the king. A similar idea is found in the Velaikkāra inscription at Polonnaruva. According to this record, Vijayabāhu I put on the crown at the request of the saṅgha to defend the sāsana.[1] In his Hāṭadāge inscription, Nissaṅka Malla states that the protection of the sāsana was the duty of the kings of Ceylon.[2]

Undoubtedly, these ideas of kingship and the attendant ceremonial would have added a religious aura to the power of the king. The claim of the kings to be Bodhisattavas and descendants of the line of the Buddha holding an office conferred by the saṅgha should have greatly helped to strengthen their position among thelay population of the land which was predominantly Buddhist. The ideas that the king of the Island should always be a Buddhist and that the Sinhalese dynasty was directly descended from the line of the Buddha seem to reflect as much the influence of Buddhism as the threat that the Sinhalese kings had to face from the rising power of the Hindu kingdoms of South India. These ideas would have been used by the Sinhalese kings to strengthen and legitimize their claims to kingship over the Island and to unite the people in support of their dynasty.

Such political ideas could be particularly useful during a time like the struggle of the Sinhalese against the Coḷa occupation of the northern provinces. However, there is no specific evidence of their being put to such use till the reign of Nissaṅka Malla who was perhaps the most adept of all local rulers in the use of propaganda for political purposes. His was an

[1] buddhaçāsanam rakṣikka vendi saṃgha-niyogattāl tirumudi śudi EI Vol. XVIII p.336 ll.8-9.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.97 ll.3-4.

insecure throne threatened by claimants of South Indian origin and local chiefs who rose in revolt. In a statement obviously directed against the latter, he says it would be ludicrous as an attempt of a firefly to emulate the sun if a man of the Govi caste were to aspire to kingship. Similarly he states, no non-Buddhist like a prince of Coḷa or Kerala origin was fit to rule the Island which belonged to the Buddhist sāsana.[1]

The concept of kingship as an office bestowed by the saṅgha was also a factor which could weaken the power of the king by making him dependent on the saṅgha. If a comparison is drawn with the later Buddhist kings of South East Asia, it seems remarkable that the Sinhalese kings did not claim to be the re-incarnation of Buddhist divinities or Buddhas, who had a natural right to rule. Theoretically, the power and the position of kingship seem to have depended on the concurrence of the saṅgha and the king. This was indeed a limiting factor on the power of the king. However, it is significant that the position of the saṅgha did not and could not rival that of kingship. For one, the absence of a single leader and the division of the saṅgha into three main rival factions were factors which weakened its authority. Owing to the dictates of the Vinaya rules which governed the life of monks, they could not themselves directly assume political authority. Even if the monks chose to ignore these regulations, the king, as the 'protector of the sāsana,' was in a positinn to enforce them. It could also be suggested that the possibilit of confiscation of monastic wealth and withdrawal of monastery privileges woul

[1] EZ Vol. II p.114 l.22.

have deterred the saṅgha from openly challenging his authority. Hence the only means by which they could obtain controlling authority over affairs of state was by appointing their nominees to the throne. They tried this twice, but in both these attempts they were unsuccessful.[1] Further, the monks were themselves dependent on the king's patronage for their maintenance and for the protection of their possessions. This interdependence of the saṅgha and the king seems to have been an important factor which maintained the balance of power in the Sinhalese society by preventing either from extending its authority.

It was pointed out earlier that this concept of kingship placed great emphasis on the role of the king as the benefactor and defender of the saṅgha. Buddhist kings, even as early as the time of Asoka, have assumed the role of the defenders of the saṅgha from schism and disunity. Asoka, in his Minor Pillar Edicts erected at Sārnāth, Kosambi and Sānci, not only orders the expulsion of all monks and nuns who attempt to cause schism and bring disunity but also instructs the mahāmātras throughout his domains to enforce this order.[2] It is not known what effect this attitude had on the sectarian divisions which had already split the saṅgha. Kings of Ceylon, though they acquiesced in the division of the saṅgha into nikāyas, seem to have considered themselves to be the defenders of the 'true faith'.[3]

It was also the king who lent the force of political authority necessary for the execution of the eccleciastical acts of the saṅgha. The 'puri-

---

[1] See p. 299.

[2] CII Vol. I pp. 159-164.

[3] Mv. 36.41, 111-112.

fications' and the ceremonies of Admission and Ordination were all carried out under his patronage. Since the division of the saṅgha into nikāyas, his participation would have been essential for the carrying out of any reforms affecting the whole Order. Reforms of the saṅgha are recorded in the chronicles in the reigns of Moggallāna I (491-508), Kumāradhātusena, Moggallāna III, Silāmeghavaṇṇa and Aggabodhi VII (772-777) as well as in the reigns of Sena II (853-887), Kassapa IV (898-914) and Kassapa V (914-923).[1] Presumably, these 'purifications by regulative acts' were concerned with discipline rather than matters of doctrine. It is specifically stated with regard to the reign of Kassapa IV that it was the monks of questionable discipline who were expelled from the Order. Parakkamabāhu I (1153-1186) was following this tradition when he worked in collaboration with Kassapa of the Dimbulāgala fraternity to expel monks who lacked discipline and to bring about the unification of the saṅgha.[2] In China, the continuous growth of the clerical population and the consequent loss of revenue and dues of the state prompted kings to carry out periodical laicizations.[3] The 'purifications' held in Ceylon should have helped Sinhalese kings to achieve the same ends and also given them a means of controlling the saṅgha.

Kassapa IV and Kassapa V are said to have made arrangements for the admission of monks after the 'purifications' they held. In his in-

---

[1] Cv., 39.57; 41.2; 44.46; 44.75-79; 48.71; 51.64; 52.10;. 52.44.

[2] See p. 468.

[3] See K. Chen, 'The economic background of the Hui Chang suppression of Buddhism', Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, vol. 19, 1956, pp. 67 ff.

scription at the Abhayagiri monastery, Kassapa V also claims to have gained adherents to Buddhism from among men of varied birth.[1] This seems to find corroboration in the Cūlavaṃsa which mentions that the king 'made poor people recite the formula of the (threefold) refuge and the nine qualities of the Buddha and then gave them food and clothing'.[2] Another king, identified as Mahinda IV, claims in his inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery that he induced people to enter the Order.[3] Vijayabāhu I revived the ceremony of Ordination which had fallen into abeyance.[4] Nissaṅka Malla seems to have taken upon himself the role of the spiritual mentor of the monks. In the Hāṭadāge and Rankotvehera inscriptions he advises them on the question of the recruitment of new monks and enjoins them to the diligent practice of the religion.[5]

It would be evident from the preceding discussion that kings played a prominent and essential role in the eccleciastical acts of the saṅgha. Apart from this, a considerable amount of the wealth of the state was used for the patronage of the Order and for the performance of religious rites. The Cūlavaṃsa mentions that the amount spent by Udaya II (887-898) during the eleven years of his rule was 1,300,000 pieces of gold.[6] It has been

---

[1] nan jäyin nan seyin budband karay EZ Vol. I p.46 l.9. Wickremasinghe's translation is inaccurate.

[2] Cv., 54.29.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.235 l.14.

[4] Cv., 60.4-8; see also p.396.

[5] EZ Vol. II pp. 96-98; Vol. V pt. II pp. 266-269.

[6] Cv., 51.135.

pointed out elsewhere that Nissaṅka Malla claims to have spent 4,700,000 pieces of gold on two festivals alone.[1] It was not often that the patronage of the kings was exceeded in extent, as in the reign of Kassapa IV, by that of the courtiers and other high officials.[2]

By the ninth century, the relationship between the king and the saṅgha had become rather complex owing to changes which had appeared in the constitution and the organization of monasteries. The monastery of this period was not merely a group of monks living together; it also represented an institution which possessed a considerable extent of land and an administrative organization to control its property and its tenants. In this context, it was the king who protected the interests of the saṅgha from the intrusions of the laity as well as the bureaucracy.

Royal officials were sometimes appointed to positions of ecclesiastical significance. In the reign of Moggallāna I (491-508), Silākāla who later became king was placed in charge of the Hair relic.[3] Kassapa V appointed his own son the guardian of the sacred text, Dhammasaṅgaṇī.[4] The title Kesadhātunāyaka seems to have become merely honorific in its significance in later times. During the period of Coḷa rule, Kassapa, a ruler of Rohaṇa, bore this title.[5] Parakkamabāhu I had two generals who had the same title. There were also three others who bore the title kesadhāta in the reign of

[1] See p.346.

[2] Cv., 52.10-36.

[3] Cv., 39.54.

[4] Cv., 52.52.

[5] Cv., 57.65.

Parakkamabāhu; these titles were conferred by the king.[1] Two instances of royal officials being appointed to posts in the monastic administration are known from the inscriptions. Mahāmati Saṅgalnāvan, a leading courtier, as evident from his title, was appointed by the mahādipāda Udaya as the chief lay official at the Udā Kitagbo Pirivena he built near the Puvaram Vehera.[2] The relic shrine of the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale was placed in charge of an official who bore the title raṭladu, 'district headman' (lit. one who received a district). Unlike the other employees he was not entitled to a remuneration in land or gold. He was given only a subsistence allowance of a daily portion of a nāliya of rice.[3] It seems likely that he was a state official who had been placed in a position of responsibility in the monastic organizations in an honorary capacity. The practice of appointing princes and dignitaries of high rank to similar positions in the temple administration was known in South India, too. According to an inscription from the Rāmnād district, Parākrama Pāṇḍya, son of Kulaśekhara, the Pāṇḍya king, was appointed the guardian of the inner entrance (ullil-vāśal) of the Āṇḍāl temple. He was assigned two mā of land and the right to a portion of the prasāda.[4] At the same monastery, there was another official who, as implied by his title,[5] seems to have had the duty of maintaining liaison with

---

[1] Cv., 70.19, 279, 283; 72.6, 59.

[2] Puliyankulam Inscription. EZ Vol. I pp. 182-190.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B37-38.

[4] MRE No. 564 of 1926.

[5] ...rajge upāni kāmiyak .. EZ Vol. I p.95 l.B9; See p.156.

the state officials. Such administrative arrangements would have facilitated close and easy relations between the state and monastic administrations.

However, the statement of Rāhula[1] that "the sāsana constituted a fully-fledged state department' amounts to an exaggeration. 'There were full and permanent staffs paid by the State,' he maintains, 'to look after the business of the larger monasteries such as Mihintale and Abhayagiri.' It would be a distortion of facts to speak in terms of 'state departments'.[2] Our discussion on the administration of monasteries reveals that the officials who managed monastic property at both Cetiyagiri and Abhayagiri were employed and maintained by the monastery concerned rather than the state.[3] There is no evidence to show that they were in the pay of the king, though the resources of these monasteries constituted, at least partly, donations made by kings.

Yet, the kings showed considerable interest in the regulation of the affairs of monasteries. The Pāli commentaries on monastic discipline, especially the Samantapāsādikā and the Khuddasikkhāṭīkā contain detailed rules, regulations and directions for the administratinn of monasteries and monastic property. In certain instances, however, kings and other patrons took the initiative in laying down sirit (= P. cāritta, 'traditions', 'customs', in a secondary sense 'regulations') for the guidance of monks and their em-

---

[1] Rāhula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, 1956, p.72.

[2] A recent writer speaks of a 'Ministry'. 'On several occasions in Sinhalese history, a special Ministryof Religion was established.' There is no factual basis for this statement. As evident from his footnotes he seems to have depended on Rāhula's work for his information. See Jnl. of Asian Studies Vol. xxiii, June 1964, p.45.

[3] See pp. 146 ff.

ployees. It is not surprising that Kassapa V, a king deeply versed in the teachings of Buddhism,[1] took the initiative toissue, in the sixth year of his reign, the Anurādhapura Slab Inscription containing immunities that the monasteries belonging to the Abhayagiri nikāya were to enjoy, detailed regulations pertaining to the administration of the monastery and its property and even directions on the recruitment and discipline of monks.[2] It is possible, however, that the inmates of the Abhayagiri monastery were consulted in the preparation of the draft of these regulations. In the regulations instituted for the Udā Kitagbo Pirivena he built, the mahādipāda Udaya fixed the number of monks who were to live at this hermitage, immunities it was to enjoy, arrangements for its administration and the means for setting disputes.[3]

An instance of a king taking the initiative to lay down sirit for a monastery is found again in the slab inscriptions of the sixteenth regnal year of Mahinda IV erected within the precincts of the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale.[4] It mentions that an earlier king who was his brother, presumably Sena IV (954-956), had also instituted a set of regulations for the same monastery.[5] The scope of the regulations is outlined early in the record: 'Thus in respect of the great community of monks living in this vihāra, as well as the respect of employees, the serfs, their respective

---

[1] See p.484 ff.

[2] EZ Vol. I pp. 41-51.

[3] EZ Vol.I pp. 182-190.

[4] EZ Vol. I pp. 75-113.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.91 11.A.5-6.

duties, and the receipts and disbursements, His Majesty passed these following regulations rendering them explicit by means of comments.'[1] This is the most extensive record available on the administrative organization of monasteries. It gives a list of officials and other employees maintained by the monastery, fixes the rates of their remuneration and sets down administrative procedure regarding the management of finances. It attempts to regulate the conduct of the employees in their relations with the monastery and the tenants. It even deals with matters such as the discipline and daily routine of monks. Though the king took the initiative in this matter, it is significant that he convened an assembly of monks from both the Abhayagiri and the Cetiyagiri monasteries for consultation. This set of regulations, the Mihintale Tablets claim, was chosen by the king in collaboration with competent persons from among the regulations which were in use at these two monasteries. Evidently, the kings thought it was their duty to ensure the proper management of monasteries.

These inscriptions provided for intervention by royal officials for the enforcement of the regulations and incases of disputes among the saṅgha. According to the Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Kassapa V, monks responsible for violation of the regulations and abetters in such offences were to be expelled from their residences.[2] This is repeated in the Mihintale Tablets.[3]

---

[1] EZ Vol. I, p.99.

[2] ..no samaṅgvä vasana pamaṇin vadā vat sirit ikmä van vathimiyanuj eyat pasavu vathimiyanuj e avasä novasavanu isa... EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.42-43.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.92 ll.A19-20.

In cases of misconduct such as quarrels among monks, the members of the mula were to settle it; if they did not succeed in settling a dispute they were to sit with royal officials to investigate into the matter and levy punishment. Royal officials were to be sent to mediate if, as a resultof a dispute, monks refused to partake of their gruel. They were to be discreetly persuaded to take the gruel; but no force was to be used. If an official is found guilty of imprudently using force, contrary to the orders of the palace, he would be dismissed from office. But if such an act be committed at the instigation of the palace authorities, the monastery was to be given a payala (of land or paddy?) in recompense.[1] All cases of misappropriation of monastic wealth were also referred to committees of investigation comprising both monks and royal officials. Monks who were found guilty were punished with expulsion.[2]

Perera has pointed out that no instance is known of a monk being disrobed for any offence.[3] It would be unwise, however, to base any conclusion on the silence of our sources. On the other hand, an instance of monks being expelled for lapses in discipline has already been mentioned.[4] Further, a statement in the inscription of Kassapa V cited above sheds some clarifying light. It lays down that monks who had been expelled to India on incurring the displeasure of the king and those who had been expelled

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.29-35.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.51-52.

[3] L. S. Perera, Institutions.... p.1440.

[4] See p.253.

from monastic life were not to be re-admitted to the monastery. Similarly, those who create a disturbance trying to admit them would also lose their right to live at the monastery.[1] Evidently, royal officials could intervene and adjudicate in matters which could lead to the expulsion of monks from the monasteries while the kings possessed the power to banish them. There is a historical instance of banishment in the reign of Goṭhābhaya.[2] Yet, we cannot be certain whether expulsion from the monastery and banishment amounted to expulsion from the Orders.

The king, it may be noted, lent the force of his authority to help the regulation of the affairs of monasteries. The need for show of force for this purpose is clearly exemplified in the regulations of the Puliyankulama hermitage which hands over the task of ensuring the adherence to the rules to the personal militia of the mahādipāda.[3]

The ninth and tenth centuries saw the proliferation of immunity grants which attempted to ensure for the monastery a source of income unencumbered by taxation and other demands of the state. A large number of these inscriptions are fragmentary and it is impossible to determine the exact extent of the immunities granted. Yet, there is much variation in the extent and the number of immunities among the well-preserved grants though their phraseology is stereotyped.

---

[1] ...udahasin Dambdī yävū vathimiyanud avasa vatin pahakaḷa vathimiyanud ovun pahakaḷa avasaṭa vaṭaḷa no vädda danu isa ovun genä vadnaṭ viyo kaḷa vathimiyanud e avashi no vasavanu isa... EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.43-45.

[2] See p.25

[3] EZ Vol. I p.187 ll.33-39; see p.174.

In more than thirty-five published grants of immunities made to monasteries, the most common clause was the exemption of väriyan (workers),[1] milch and draught cattle, buffaloes and carts from being sequestered for service to the state. Such immunities were not restricted to monastic lands alone. There are instances of similar grants being made to land belonging to private individuals, dispensaries and villages in general.

The mention of väriyan, 'those who served in turn', is significant as it probably represents the right to corvée labour that the king enjoyed. In the Nöccipotāna inscription dated to the reign of Udaya II (887-898), it is specifically stated that the workers from the land in question were not to be sequestered for irrigation work.[2] The Mannar Kacceri inscription of Kassapa IV and the Kataragama inscription of Dappula IV(V) (924-935) state that väriyan as well as kudīn[3] were not to be commandeered from these monastic villages.[4] This, of course, did not amount to the exemption of the tenants from corvée duty. It merely implied the transfer of this royal prerogative to the monastery. Evidently, not all the monasteries enjoyed the privilege. Certain immunity grants like the Puḷiyankulam inscription of Mahādipāda Udaya and the Vessagiri inscription of Mahinda IV do not carry this provision.[5] The Polonnaruva Rājamaligāva inscription of the latter

[1] See p.186

[2] EZ Vol. II pp.5-8; see p.186

[3] For a discussion on the term, see p.99 n.1

[4] EZ Vol. III pp.100-113, 219-25.

[5] EZ Vol. I pp. 29-38, 182-190.

permits officials to employ men who had come on their own to serve their turn at the corvée(!); but they were not to enter the monastic village to raise labour.[1]

It is very probable that the term var which occurs in some inscriptions is related to väri; presumably the latter was derived from the former. Var (Skt. and P. vāra) normally means among other things 'turn' or 'opportunity in alternating order'[2] but has also been used in the sense of 'turn of service'. Its occurrence in the Mihintale slab inscription is of particular interest and illustrative of its meaning. The record mentions the tundāvar, 'the three day turn of service' to which the monastery was entitled.[3] Certain records like the Tāmravāva inscription of Sena II and the Gonnāva Devale inscription of Dappula IV (V) do not refer to väriyan in granting immunities but state that no demands be made for 'turns of service' like suvar and mahavar from the lands of the respective monasteries.[4] The Mihintale slabs turn over the maňg mahavar to the monastery.[5] In the light of the remarks made above, the terms suvar and mahavar may be rendered into English as 'the lesser turn of service' and 'the principal turn of service' and maňg mahavar as 'the principal turn of service on roads'. It is also possible that these connoted taxes or payments made in lieu of these services.

---

[1] The line is not veryu clear: ... (ā väriyan misa a)seli(n) gamaṭ vädä väriyan noganna isā... EZ Vol. II p.54 ll.C1-4.

[2] See its use in Sigiri Graffiti, Vol. II v.v.305, 330.

[3] ...tun dā var mut poho maňgul āy sesa var nogaḷā yutu... EZ Vol. I p. 67 ll.A44-45.

[4] EZ Vol. V pt. II pp. 280-288; Vol. IV pp. 184-191.

[5] EZ Vol. I p.97 ll.B54-55.

Inscriptions also mention a considerable number of dues and imposts like melāṭsi (var. melāssi, melācci), maṅgiv pegiv (var. maṅgdiv piyadiv, maṅgiva piyagiva, peṅgiva, pediv), kulī, demeḷ kulī, heḷ kulī and sutvat (tolls) from which the monastic lands were exempted.[1] No clarifying evidence is available, however, to determine the exact nature of these dues.

An important aspect that some of these grants covered was the right to irrigation.[2] According to the Polonnaruva Rājamāligāva inscription, Mahinda IV ordered the velvässan and the velkämiyan to refrain from interfering with the irrigation rights of a monastery.[3] Codrington has suggested that the piyovadāraṇan who are forbidden to enter monastic property in six of the published records were also irrigation officials.[4]

---

[1] Paranavitana equates melāṭsi with Skt. uparikara, pointing out that the two words are synonymous (upari = P. mel 'above'; kara = aṭsi 'tax'). EZ Vol. III pp.110-111. The present writer could not find an instance of the use of the word aṭsi in Tamil in the sense of 'tax'. But it is apparent in many inscriptions that it connoted dues or a tax. Wickremasinghe rendered maṅgiv pegiv as 'tramps and vagrants' EZ Vol. II p.5; Paranavitana believed they were royal officials EZ Vol. III p.146. In a large number of inscriptions the maṅgiv pegiv are instructed not to enter the lands to which immunities had been granted. In one inscription the phrase maṅgiv pediv no vadnā isā is followed by sesu radkolkämiyan no vadna isa, 'other royal officials are not to enter" AIC No. 113. Hence Paranavitana's explanation is plausible. Yet, it is important that in certain immunity grants, officials are requested not to take maṅgiv pediv, EZ Vol. I p.205 ll.C18-21; Vol. II p.37 ll.C.15-16. Here it seems to refer to a due. No satisfactory explanation of kulī is possible.

[2] See pp. 96-97.

[3] EZ Vol. II p.53 ll. B33-41.

[4] EZ Vol. III p.110.

A detailed examination of the inscriptions dealing with immunity grants show that the greater majority of them exempt the land concerned from interference by officials called melāṭsi, maṅgiva pegiva and perenāṭṭu (var. perenāṭṭi, perenāṭṭiyam, perenāṣṭiyam).[1] There seems to have been a few different types of melāṭsi. Some are called dunumaṅḍula melaṭsi, some kulī melāṭsi and others maṅgmahavar melāṭsi, while in certain instances the term melāṭsi occurs on its own. Probably, melāṭsi and maṅgiva pegiva are terms used to denote the officials who dealt with the dues known by these names.

In his explanation of the term perenāṭṭu, Paranavitana[2] selects the variant form perenāṭṭiyam and examines it along with ulvāḍu. He equates ulvāḍu with ulpāḍu and takes ul to mean 'interior' and pāḍu 'nāṭṭiyam Pere in perenāṭṭiyam is taken to mean 'front' or 'outside' and nāṭṭiyam to mean 'dancing'. He compares these two terms with the phrase antaraṅga bahiraṅga kārya in the Butsarana.[3] The Cūlavaṃsa mentions an official who held the antaraṅgadhura under Parakkamabāhu I.[4] Paranavitana interprets antaraṅga as 'inner theatre' and bahiraṅga as 'outer theatre' and on this analogy suggests, 'Ulvāḍu, most probably, were a class of functionaries who had the right of entry to the inner music hall of the royal palace, and perenāṭṭu a lower grade who were not permitted to proceed further than the

[1] Change of medial u to i is not uncommon in both Sinhalese and Tamil. cf. cumbati > siṁbiyi; vāḍuka > vāḍikai.

[2] EZ Vol. V pt I p.140 n.2.

[3] Butsarana (Sorata ed.) 1953, p.154.

[4] Cv., 69.32, 35.

dancing hall in the outer precincts of the palace'.

Unfortunately, the evidence offered for this highly imaginative explanation is neither convincing nor authentic. Paranavitana's rendering of the terms antaraṅga and bahiraṅga is unlikely. His interpretation would suggest that there were two music halls - 'the inner singing' and 'the outer dancing' which were of considerable significance in the daily routine of the palace administration; but this has no factual basis. On the other hand, the phrase antaraṅgaBabahiraṅga kārya, if used in an administrative sense, could be more easily rendered into English as 'business concerning the inside and the outside'. A division of administrative business into 'inside' and 'outside' affairs is noticeable even in the administrative organization of monasteries.[1] Antaraṅgadhura could denote the charge of the affairs which came directly under the control of the king and the central administration as distinct from those of the provinces. Parakkamabāhu I placed the most valuable land under the control of the antaraṅgadhura. In fact, in this passage, the minister of the antaraṅgadhura is contradistinguished from those of the provinces (vijita).[2]

It is significant that in most cases perenāṭṭu occurs in conjunction with väri. Nāṭṭu should be derived from nāṭu, 'province'. Perenāṭṭu could indicate an official in charge of a province and väriperenāṭṭu may denote a

[1] ätul bähäri EZ Vol. I p.92 ll.A22-23. See also p.156 . Cf antovalañja and bahivalañja. In the Mahāsāra Jātaka the terms are used to distinguish the precincts of the palace from the outside. Fausboll, Jātaka Vol. I pp. 382, 385; in the Telapatta Jātaka, a king gives the power over antovalañja to an ogress who charmed him. Jātaka, Vol. I p.398.

[2] Cv., 69.32-35.

provincial official in charge of corvée labour. Nāṭu as a verbal root has the meaning of 'to inspect, examine or inquire'. If this derivation is accepted, väriperenāṭṭu would denote 'inspectors of outside affairs in charge of the corvée'; it could also be translated as 'inspectors of outside affairs who visited the provinces in turn'.[1]

The term deruvanä dekamtän is second only to melāṭṣi in the number of its occurrence in inscriptions. It does not occur in any of the literary works. Kamtän, it has been pointed out elsewhere,[2] could connote an 'office' or 'officials' in a secondary sense. Paranavitana[3] has made the plausible suggestinn that deruvana may refer to 'two treasuries'. Two treasury establishments were known in the state as well as temple administrations of South India. If this interpretation is accepted, this immunity would amount to the exemption of the property concerned from interference of the treasury officials

It is noteworthy that almost all the official titles cited so far seem to be connected with the collection of dues and the fiscal administration. The higher number of incidence of these terms clearly reveal that the primary consideration behind the grants of immunities was to exempt the monastery from the encumbrance of the payment of regular taxes due to the king.

It is also evident that the need to protect the monasteries from the burdensome demands and disruptive interference of the officials and retainers of the king was another guiding motive behind these immunity grants.

---

[1] For ulvādu, see p.275

[2] See pp.151 ff.

[3] EZ Vol. III pp.143-144.

Many records prohibit the entry of mercenaries and other men bearing arms into monastic lands.[1] In certain inscriptions soldiers and officials are specifically advised to desist from creating trouble or committing misdeeds within these lands.[2] Attempts of king's men to forcibly fell trees on monastic grounds was one source of trouble. This was forbidden in the Anurādhapura Slab inscription of Mahinda IV.[3] The Puliyankulam inscription of Mahādipāda Udaya forbids royal officials to fell palmyra and mī trees within monastic precincts.[4] Similarly, the Polonnaruva Rājamāligāva inscription of Mahinda IV forbids state officials in charge of agriculture to fell palmyra and coconut palms belonging to the monastery concerned.[5] An inscription at Mihintale instructs the committee of management of the monastery to sit in judgment and punish any such offenders guilty of violation of the proprietary rights of the monastery.[5]

In the Gonnāva inscription of Dappula IV (V) and the Ambagamuva inscription of Vijayabāhu I, officials are forbidden to accept presents.[6] Most grants of immunities carry the provision that lands concerned were exempted from supplying bilibat, bilisāl and värisāl. In certain cases the exemption was extended to include the supply of milk, co-agulated milk

---

[1] These include men bearing staves (daṅdu muraṅdu gatuvan, däti gatuvan), iron club (yamaguru gatuvan), swords (kolpaṭṭin) and nooses or canes (välgattan cf. daṇḍapāsika).

[2] ākul nokaranu EZ Vol. I p.33 l.35; aniyā nokaranu EZ Vol. I p.93 l.A49.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.187 ll.27-28.

[4] Velvässan EZ Vol. II p.54 ll.66-7. As Paranavitana pointed out the term vässan has been used in the sense of employees. EZ Vol. III p.113. Cf veherä vässan EZ Vol. III p.104 ll.C.19-20 and veḍhal vässan EZ Vol. II

[5] Müller, AIC No. 113.

[6] EZ Vol. IV p.189 l.C1; Vol. II p.214 l.B46.

(dihi) and oil. In explaining the terms bilibat and bilisāl, the Mihintale Tablets come to our aid. They lay down that monastic officials who went on official tours were not to demand any provisions other than the customary bilisāl from the tenants of the villages they visited.[1] Further evidence is found in the Sahassavatthupakaraṇa. It contains a story which refers to a royal official who visited a village on official business being provided with balibhatta at lunch time.[2] Another story in the same collection speaks of a royal official who visited a village and was treated to chicken curry, ghee, rice and liquor to go withit.[3] Hence, there is little doubt that bilibat and bilisāl were boiled and raw rice which the villagers had to supply to visiting officials. One cannot be certain, however, whether värisāl meant rice supplied to feed the corvée workers or rice supplied by villagers in turn to the local officials. The Anurādhapura slabinscription of Kassapa V instructs officials not to seek lodging in monastic villages.[4]

Exemption of the tenant from his customary obligation towards the state officials does not necessarily imply an improvement of his condition. It seems merely to indicate, as evident from the Mihintale Tablets, the transfer of these rights to the monastic officials. Their demands, the same record implies, were hardly less severe.[5]

About six inscriptions from the tenth century carry the provision

---

[1] ...veherat kämin giya kämiyan haskaruvan dena peresirit bilisāl mut ratin väṭum no gatä yutu ... EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A46-47.

[2] Shsvp., p.40.

[3] Ibid., p.180.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.47 ll.27-28.

[5] See pp.283-284.

that laymen should not enter the premises of monastic property concerned, with musical accompaniments.[1] This was a privilege which was mainly ceremonial in its significance. The custom of suspending musical accompaniments to observe a respectful silence while passing a sacred place or monument was known from early times. The Mahāvaṃsa records that the practice of stopping all music while passing the grave of Eḷāra, in accordance with the privileges granted to it by Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, was continued by the royalty even till the time of the chronicles.[2] The instruments mentioned in the inscriptions are tuḍi, soḷī and balat rähän. Paranavitana has remarked that the first two terms probably connoted types of drums while the third may refer to whip cracking.[3]

The advantages accruing to monasteries from grants of immunities were by no means restricted to financial gain and ceremonial privileges. There are reasons to believe that they limited the controlling authority of the state officials over lands and villages belonging to the monasteries. According to the Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa II, royal officials were not to enter monastic property to fell trees or sequester workmen, carts, oxen and buffaloes.[4] The Puḷiyankulam inscription orders them not to enter to fell trees. A similar injunction against the levy of workmen, carts and buffaloes is found in the Kataragama inscription of

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.197 ll.C18-19; Vol. III p.140 ll.C26-27; Vol. IV p.159 ll.3-5.

[2] Mv., 25.73-74.

[3] Cf tuḍi soḷī bera in the Itava inscription and soḷī bera tuḍi gattan in the Pallekagama inscription; tuḍi occurs in this sense in the Śilappadikāram Canto VI l.51. EZ Vol. III pp. 146-147.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.47 ll.17-18.

Dappula IV (V).[1] The Kaludiyapokuṇa record decrees that the official of any of the 'three royal establishments' (tun radola) was to enter to levy these dues.[2] It is evident from the grants cited above that the authority of the royal officials to carry out their administrative functions was limited but not completely withdrawn. It is significant, however, that in about twelve of the published records royal officials are categorically forbidden to enter monastic property.[3]

Apparently, these restrictions were extended to include the administrative officials at provincial and district level. They are ordered not to collect dues from monastic property in the Tripinniyāva inscription of Kassapa IV.[4] According to the Moragoḍa inscription of the same king and the Mādirigiriya inscription of Kassapa V, these officials - the raṭladu and the pasladu-were not to 'enjoy the land' or 'exercise authority' therein.[5] In seven other instances they are categorically forbidden to enter monastic lands.[6] This particular immunity, however, finds no mention in records after the time of Dappula IV (V) (924-935). In certain cases the rights of velkämiyan, velvässan, and velbädiyan and veläyut pasdenā who were most probably concerned with irrigation and agriculture were with-

[1] EZ Vol. III p.223 ll.C8-14.

[2] EZ Vol. III p.26 ll.40-41; for tun radola, see UHC Vol. I pt. I p.367.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 163-171, 172-173, 200-207; Vol. II pp. 14-19, 19-25, 34-38, 38-43, 44-49, 64-70; Vol. III pp. 100-113; Vol. IV pp.246-252.

[4] EZ Vol. I pp. 168-169 ll.C7-17.

[5] novalaňdanu koṭisā EZ Vol. I pp. 204-205 ll.B19-C1.
Isir no karanu isa EZ Vol. II p.31 ll.B21-24.

[6] EZ Vol. II pp.42 ll.B81-C3, 24 ll.C1-4, 37 ll.B18-C1, 47 ll.C5-7; Vol. III pp. 104 ll.18-21, 274 ll.C21-24, 290 ll.7-9.

drawn; but these terms are found only in four of the published grants.[1]

It becomes quite evident from an examination of the immunity grants of this period that considerable powers were transferred to the monastic administration by withholding the authority of the state officials to intervene in their affairs. The most important immunity granted to the monastery, from an administrative point of view, was perhaps that which dealt with the judicial rights.

The immunity of monks from punishment, declared in the Mahāvagga as a principle accepted even in the time of Bimbisāra, was undoubtedly known in Ceylon; but it is not certain whether it was always respected. As early as in the first century A.D., Kaṇirajānutissa, incensed at the high treason contemplated by some members of the saṅgha, had sixty of the suspects thrown into the 'dungeon of Kaṇira'.[2] In the seventh century, Saṅghatissa who had lost his campaigns against the rival contender for power, Moggallāna III, donned the yellow robe to escape to Rohaṇa.[3] It is not certain whether the garb of the monk was supposed to be a mere disguise or whether Saṅghatissa thought it would make him immune from capture. Nevertheless, he was recognized, captured and executed. These two examples, however, represent two highly extraordinary incidents and it is difficult to derive any reliable conclusions from this evidence. The

[1] Others like yahangovvan (chamberlains), mahaputiladdan (administrators of ports), käbili laddan (recipients of land allotments) and sadāladdan (?) find occasional mention in the grants.

[2] Mv., 35.10-11.

[3] Cv., 44.29-36.

inscription of Kassapa V shows that the king had the power to banish monks from the Island; but it is not clear whether this punishment was tried in cases other than belief in 'false views' and violations of regulations and rules of discipline.[1] But, considering the privileges granted to monasteries, one may surmise that during the period under consideration the immunity of the monks from the authority of king's courts was respected.

Judicial immunities of many varied types occur in the grants of this period. The most far-reaching were those which ensured complete immunity for offenders seeking refuge in monastic lands. The Iripinniyāva and Rambāva inscriptions of Kassapa IV which record immunities granted to land held by the Sen Senevirad Pirivena of the Mahāvihāra, explicitly state that 'thieves and those who entered after committing assault' were not to be arrested.[2] In the Kukurmahandamana inscription, Kassapa IV granted the immunity that no one who sought refuge with Kerelāgama village belonging near the Mihindaram nunnery was to be arrested.[3] The Ayitigevāva inscription, which records a similar grant to a piece of land belonging to the Tisaram nunnery states that 'those who entered after committing assault' were not to be arrested.[4] The precincts of the preaching hall built by

---

[1] See pp. 253, 258.

[2] Sorun koṭāvan noganna koṭ EZ Vol. I p.169 ll.C19-23, p.174 ll.B14-17.

[3] EZ Vol. II pp.19-25.

[4] EZ Vol. II pp.34-38.

Nissaṅka Malla enjoyed complete judicial privileges.[1] According to the inscription at the site, even those criminals guilty of the most grave crimes (mahāparādha) enjoyed immunity from arrest on entering its premises.

Immunities granted to a preaching hall are of little practical significance. Obviously, a criminal could not enjoy this immunity for very long. Judicial immunities in such cases would have been considered an honour rather than a privilege. The privileges in the Rambāva and Ayitigevāva inscriptions concerned relatively small pieces of land; but the Iripinniyāva grant covered a fairly extensive area and the Nāgama inscription a whole village. No evidence whatsoever is available in the contemporary literary works on the attitude of the monastic administration towards criminals who sought refuge in their land. The absence of detail and specification in this type of grant leaves many questions unanswered. Probably, the kings did not expect that in conferring these 'honours' on monasteries they would complicate the process of justice. It is possible, however, that the ambiguity of the grants had the very same effect and led in certain instances to cases of friction between the temporal and the monastic authorities.[2]

The second type of immunity grant is even more laconic and ambiguous. A number of inscriptions direct the officials not to enter monastic land to arrest offenders responsible for assault. According to the Tāmravāva inscription of Sena II, officials were not to enter the village Saḷinnarugam

---

[1] EZ Vol. II pp. 165-178,

[2] See pp. 296 et seq.

belonging to the Sen Senevirad Pirivena even to arrest thieves who entered it after committing murder.[1] It may be pointed out that this privilege was extended further in the Iripinniyāva inscription which concerns the same property.[2] A similar privilege was granted to the village Mahagā-piṭova of the Kāsub Senevirad Pirivena of the Mahāvihāra; the authority of the state officials to enter the village to arrest offenders who had committed assault was withdrawn.[3]

It appears that the restrictions imposed on two types of officials, the pereläkkan (var. piraläkkan) and the ulvāḍu (var. ulvāḍi, ulpāḍu, ulpāḍi) preventing them from entering certain monastic lands, amounted to the award of a judicial immunity, to the property in question. Immunity from interference by pereläkkan occurs in six of the known inscriptions; ulvāḍu occurs in three.[4] In the Timbirivāva inscription of Kassapa IV, the pereläkkan are directed to return to the Māḍabiyan Pirivena, all the income from the fines they levied in the Mibāḷigama village belonging to this hermitage.[5] According to the Koṇḍavaṭṭavan inscription, criminals guilty of homicide were to be handed over to the ulvāḍu.[6] Evidently, both pereläkkan and ulvāḍu were employees associated with the execution of justice.

---

[1] EZ Vol. V pt. II p.285 ll.D3-9.

[2] See p.273

[3] EZ Vol. II pp.38-43; see also p.273

[4] EZ Vol. II pp.9-14, 14-25, 38-43, 44-49, 49-57; Vol. III pp.100-113; EZ Vol. I pp. 191-200; Vol. II pp.44-49; Vol. III pp.219-225.

[5] EZ Vol. II pp.9-14. For comments on pereläki see EZ Vol. III p.145.

[6] EZ Vol. V pt. I p.138 ll.C31-35. The term ulpāḍan occurs in a Tamil in- (cont.)

The restrictions imposed on state officials preventing them from entering monastic property to make arrests do not necessarily imply that the criminals concerned escaped punishment. Unfortunately, these records do not explain the procedure followed in such cases. A few more details are found in certain other grants. The Mādirigiriya inscription of Kassapa V and the Polonnaruva Rājamāligāva inscription of Mahinda IV which award similar immunities specify that offenders who had entered the village after committing assault were to be arrested after they were made to quit the village; a tenth-century inscription in the Colombo Museum adds that the assistance of the villagers was to be sought in having them evicted.[1] It is significant that all the inscriptions cited in this paragraph are concerned with the apprehension of only those offenders responsible for assault. The Ambagamuva inscription of Vijayabāhu I which deals with immunities granted to an extensive area comprising four villages apart from other property, goes further to provide for the apprehension of criminals responsible for offences falling within the purview of the 'five grave crimes'.[2]

(cont.) scription as the title of a temple official. But his functions are not clearly evident. Travancore Archaeological Series Vol. III p.164. See also EZ Vol. III p.145.

[1] ...gama va(n kę)nekun äta gamvä(ssan) lavā(pi‡at) karā (ganut) misä (gama‡) vädä no (ganna) isa... EZ Vol. IV p.251 ll.D.3-10.

[2] An exact definition of the 'five grave crimes' (pañcamahāparādha) seems to be an almost impossible task. Manu (xi.55) gives killing a Brahman, drinking liquor, theft, committing adultery with the wife of the spiritual teacher and associating with one who had committed any of these as the pañcamahāpātakas,'the five grave lapses'. Other works like Vasiṣṭha (I. 19-22) and Āpastambha (I.7.21.8) do not completely agree with this list.

(cont.)

All these records refer to offenders who had 'entered' villages or estates under monastic control. They do not prescribe the measures for the arrest of offenders among the regular residents of monastic lands. Further, the successful working of the arrangements made for the apprehension of criminals who sought refuge in lands which enjoyed judicial immunity would depend entirely on the co-operation of the tenants and the monastic officials. The inscriptions considered so far do not state that they were obliged to hand over the offenders. Neither do the grants specify the measures to be taken in the event of non-compliance on their part.

The Moragoḍa inscription of Kassapa IV and the Kaḷudiyapokuṇa inscription of Sena IV represent two attempts to overcome these difficulties.

(cont.) The Toḍuṅkeyal, a Tamil work, enumerates killing, lying, stealing, drinking liquor and abusing one's guru as the pañcamahāpātakam (TL p. 2409). The Buddhist sources speak of the pañcanantarikakamma. In explaining this term, five of the six abhiṭhānas (viz. matricide, parricide, killing an arahant, causing schism, wounding the Buddha and following other teachers) or the offences mentioned in the five sīlas (killing, theft, sexual misconduct, lying and intemperance) are enumerated. (Khuddakapāṭha Aṭṭhakathā, 1915, p.189; Milindapañṭhā, 1880, p.25; Vinaya Vol. II p.193; Saddharmālaṅkara, Bentota Saddhatissa, 1931, p.774). It is doubtful whether the five grievous sins were considered to be the five grave crimes in a legal sense. The Vevälkäṭiya inscription lists seven major crimes which carried heavy punishment: 1. assault resulting in murder (marā keṭuva), 2. assault and plunder (kaṅda paḷā sorakam ṉaḷa), 3. assault not resulting in murder (no marā keṭuva) 4. atpavahalaṭ giyaku (interpretation doubtful), 5. killing of buffaloes, cattle and goat (mivuṉ geri gon eḷuvan māruva), 6. stealing without killing (no marā sorā giya) and 7. violating orders (anamäkuva, Wickremasinghe translates this to mean defacing brand-marks). This does not enable a precise definition of the 'five grave offences' though some of the offences listed above may have been among them. EZ Vol. I pp. 242-251.

Both contain grants of extensive immunities; but they are awarded with an important qualifying provision. The first record directs the monastic officials to evict offenders guilty of assault from the village in question.[1] The second contains a strict exhortation to monastic officials not to admit an outsider who had committed assault or murder. Nor was any resident who had committed such an offence to be harboured within the precincts of the monastic lands; they were to be evicted after their gedad was taken.[2] No satisfactory explanationof this term gedaṅḍ is available. The context of its occurrence suggests that it was some form of penalty.[3] It is evident from the ninth-century Sanskrit record from the Abhayagiri monastery that the practice of confiscating the property of offenders was known.[4] Gedaṅḍ (Skt. grhadaṇḍa) may connote the same.

The slab inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery dated in the sixth regnal year of Kassapa V[5] is perhaps the most remarkable grant of immunities as, unlike the others, it covers the entire area which came under a nikāya. It is also a highly detailed and comprehensive grant which seems to represent an attempt of the king to obtain greater control over the punishment of criminals by curtailing to some extent the judicial privileges

---

[1] ...me gämhi keṭṭō (ke)nekun äta gämin piṭat karanuisā ... EZ Vol. I p.205 ll.D2-6. Wickremasinghe's translation of the next line... koṭā vannavun vädä no(gan)nāisā ... as 'Those who have entered the village after committing a murder shall not be harboured', p.207, is inaccurate. The rendering of vädä is questionable in view of its occurrence in EZ Vol. III pp.76 l.B23, 140 l.C24

[2] ...bähärä minī koṭā no väddä denu isā raṭä hondä minī keṭuva kämiyan unge gedaḍ genä piṭat karanu isa... EZ Vol. III p.265 ll.32-33.

[3] See for example EZ Vol. I pp. 47 l.25, 93 l.A37, 247 l.19.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.23-24.

[5] EZ Vol. I pp. 41-57.

enjoyed by monasteries. It makes a significant departure from the normal practice and retains the right of officials to enter monastic estates and punish criminals: 'If there be any persons in a village held to be guilty of murder, the king's employees may enter that village and demand them, but only them; no wrong shall be done to other villagers who had not abetted these offenders... If there be any who, after committing murder, have taken refuge in the premises of the saṅgha, these offenders and those who abetted them shall be tried and sentenced to be exiled to Dambdiv.[1]

The authority of the royal officials extended also to cases other than murder. Once in every two years, the officials of the central administration[2] who went on tours of investigation were to demand the surrender of all offenders guilty of the 'five grave crimes'; it was specified that they were not to interfere with less severe cases which did not fall under this category. Further, in levying punishments for offences other than murder, the penalty of gedad was to be avoided; nor should the offenders be banished. Another clause states that king's officials who sought refuge with the saṅgha to escape repayment of debts due to the treasury were to be apprehended and made to pay the money they owed; but they were to be spared of other indignities.[3] The list of 'immunities' in the Abhayagiri inscription

---

[1] ..miṉi keṭũ kenekun äta gamaṭ väda ovun mä illat mut sesu ehi no pahaḷa sesu kuḍinaṭ aniya nokaranu isa... mini koṭa saṅgun van tänaṭ van kenekun äta ehi pahaḷa vanud ovunuj vicarakoṭ Dambdiv yavanaṭ harna isa... EZ Vol. I p.47 ll.18-19,24-25.

[2] rajkol s amdaruvan . Wickremasinghe translated this as 'the princes of the royal family'.

[3] For a discussion on the interpretation of the passage, see p.177.

makes it abundantly clear that criminals who sought refuge within monastic estates as well as the tenants of these lands guilty of the 'five grave crimes were brought under the jurisdiction of the royal officials. It was made possible for royal officials not only to enter monastic estates but to levy punishments on offenders living or hiding therein. The penalties levied, however, may have been less severe than outside.[1] Provision was made for high officials in charge of judicial affairs and other high dignitaries to sit in judgment and make remissions in cases of disputes and complaints over fines imposed by lower officials.

This does not imply that the monastic administration was completely divested of its judicial authority. Evidently, all such cases which did not fall under the 'five grave crimes' came under their control. This is also implied in the instructions to the royal officials not to impose additional fines on cases on which fines had already been levied, presumably, by the monastic officials. This gives precedence to the rights of the monastic officials in areas of judicial administratinn the limits of which had not been clearly defined.

The grant of Kassapa V was in certain respects a withdrawal of immunities. For, some of the villages of the Abhayagiri nikāya had been enjoying much more extensive immunities.[2] In a sense, it was a reasonable definition of the relative rights of the king and the monastery. This

---

[1] Cf. punishments prescribed in the Vevälkäṭiya record. EZ Vol. I pp. 241-251.

[2] See e.g. EZ Vol. I pp. 200-207.

grant took the necessary steps to safeguard the pecuniary interests the monastery would have in judicial immunities. All the fines collected on the estates of the main monastery were to be set apart for its use. A similar arrangement was in force in Mibäligama, a village attached to the Mādabiyan Pirivena.[1] Such an arrangement ensured for the monastery the income accruing from judicial proceedings but at the same time curtailed those privileges which hindered the normal and efficient administration of justice.

The immunity grants of the period under consideration reveal a great deal of variation in the extent and types of the immunities granted. This variation does not fit into a coherent chronological pattern; nor could it be maintained that the variation is related to the importance of the monastery concerned. Perhaps, it was regulated by factors like the personal relations of the king with the abbots of these monasteries and internal political conditions the evidence on which has not been preserved.

In his discussion on monastic property, Rāhula, apparently, considered only some of these immunity grants. 'If anyone entered these lands and villages for protection or asylum', he maintains, 'he could not be arrested there. Should there by any unworthy of protection, they could be arrested only after they had been made to quit the temple lands.'[2] It is evident from our discussion that this statement is not true of all the

---

[1] EZ Vol. II pp.9-14.

[2] Rāhula, op.cit., p.142.

immunity grants. Further, it is noteworthy that not all the monastic estates enjoyed judicial immunities. The Puḷiyankulam inscription of Mahādipāda Udaya and the Mayilagastoṭa inscription of Ādipāda Mahinda do not mention judicial immunities. Yet, in almost all the instances where immunities were granted, there is reason to believe that the monastery enjoyed jurisdiction over at least the cases concerning minor offences. This kept themonastery involved in the maintenance of order and the administration of justice.

If the association of the king with the saṅgha helped to legitimize his position through religious sanction, it also led on his part, to a gradual abdication of his economic rights and political authority over a section of the people. Monasteries were no longer mere centres of religious activity; they had developed into institutions wielding an economic and administrative control over the residents of a considerable extent of land. It is evident from our study of immunity grants that in most cases the control that the state retained over monastic lands amounted to the right to intervene in cases of disputes within monasteries and the right to apprehend and punish criminals guilty of grave offences. It was also incumbent upon the kings to ensure the rights of the tenants to their land and to protect them from harsh treatment and the undue exactions of monastic officials. On the other hand, they also had to safeguard the interests of the saṅgha. These duties necessitated a close supervisory control over the monastic administration. The interest that the kings showed in these matters is reflected in some of the regulations in the Kaludiyapokuṇa

inscription of Sena III and the Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV.

The deprivation of the tenantry living under the control of religious establishments due to the acquisitive tendencies of their officials was a phenomenon known in South India. An eleventh century Vaṭṭeluṭṭu inscription from Tirukkāḍittānam issued by Bhāskara Ravivarman forbids temple officials to take on mortgage or for cultivation the land allotments held by the drummers of the Viṣṇu temple at the site.[1] The Sinhalese kings of this period faced the same problem. The Mihintale Tablets decree that no allotments held by cultivators on terms of hereditary succession were to be seized by the monastery except on failure of succession.[2] More latitude was allowed in the case of allocations to employees. The property of 'good employees' was not to be confiscated by the officials unless it was meant for the use of the monastery.[3] If our interpretation is correct, this would imply that, unlike in the case of cultivators, the allocations made to employees were liable to confiscation by the monastery even if their conduct was not deemed 'unsatisfactory'. The Kaludiyapokuṇa inscription orders that taxes higher or lower than the customary rates were not to be levied by the monastic administration.[4] Tenants of monastic estates could also be vexed by demands for extra services during religious festivals. The Mihintale Tablets specify that apart fromthe 'three

[1] Travancore Archaeological Series Vol. V pp. 178-180.

[2] ...haskaru parapuren väṭena kärä kumbur noväṭiya het mut härä nogatä yutu... EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.48-49.

[3] ..sudasun vat veherat mut kämiyan nogatä yutu... EZ Vol. I p.93 p.A43.

[4] ...pere siritin vaḍā kiṇa karavuvara nobandanā īsā... EZ Vol. III p.265.

day turn of service' no corvée was to be levied on uposatha days or during religious festivals.[1]

Much more attention was devoted to the problem of controlling the activities of monastic officials. Apart from the possibility of officials abusing their authority to get their land cultivated by tenants, there was also the tendency of officials to acquire land by purchase or mortgage. The Kaludiyapokuṇa inscription set apart two villages as remuneration to officials; they were instructed not to seize cattle, buffaloes or serfs from other villages for their use. Nor were they to take land on mortage, pamaṇu[2] tenure or for cultivation. The statements on the Mihintale Tablets amount almost to a reiteration of these regulations. In this record, the officials were forbidden to acquire the land of the monastery on mortgage, or pamuṇu, paṭṭa and kärä tenure; they were not to use the draught oxen of these villages to cultivate their own lands. Nothing untoward was to be committed within private holdings; trees could be felled only if permission had been obtained from the kamtän.[3] Officials who go on tour should not demand from the tenants anything other than the portion of rice they are entitled to by custom; nor should they accept any presents.[4]

It would appear that the tenants of monastic estates who were freed from interference by royal officials were confronted with the possibility of

---

[1] ...tun dā var mut poho maṅgul ǟy sesu var no gatä yutu... EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A44-45.

[2] For explanation of this term see p. 190.

[3] For explanation of this term see p. 154.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A45-51.

maltreatment by monastic officials. In such cases, royal intervention would, no doubt, have been beneficial. It is not at all clear, however, whether this supervisory control was adequately regular and effectual.

The close relationship which prevailed between the saṅgha and the state was bound to be shaken in times of foreign invasion and foreign rule. The Pāṇḍya invasion in the reign of Sena I was disastrous in its effects on the main monasteries of Anurādhapura. The golden image of the Buddha of the Ratanapāsāda, the jewel-eyes of the stone image, gold plates from the Thūpārāma stūpa and golden images from other shrines were plundered.[1] During the Coḷa invasion in the reign of Udaya IV, the Maṇipāsāda, the hall of the four cetiya, at the Padalañchana and the shrine of the Tooth relic were burnt down. Presumably, the Dhammasaṅgaṇī house and the Mahāpāli alms-hall were also destroyed.[2] The campaigns that the Coḷas led into Rohaṇa during their occupation of Rājaraṭṭha were marked by similar instances of destruction. The author of the Cūḷavaṃsa complains that many monasteries were destroyed and plundered.[3] Further, he makes specific mentinn of the relic shrines at Mahāgāma destroyed by the Coḷas being rebuilt by Vijayabāhu I.[4] His uparāja, Vīrabāhu, restored the Buddhaguṇa cetiya which had been ransacked by the Coḷas.[5] It is possible

[1] Cv., 50.33-36. The golden image was later brought back. Cv., 51.48-49.

[2] Cv., 54.44-45.

[3] Cv., 55.20-21.

[4] Cv., 60.56.

[5] Cv., 60.81.

that the shrines at Mahiyaṅgaṇa and Mädirigiriya were also despoiled during these campaigns.[1]

In its account of the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, the Cūlavaṃsa records that he repaired Ratnavāluka (Mahāthūpa), Abhayagiri, Jetavana and Mariccavaṭṭi stūpas and the Lohapāsāda, which had been destroyed by the Coḷas.[2] The Pūjavaliya corroborates this statement with regard to the first three stūpas; it adds Thūpārāma to the list. The Lohapāsāda is mentioned as a shrine repaired during this reign but it is not included in this list.[3] It is rather difficult to believe, however, that Vijayabāhu I who ruled for forty years after winning back Rājaraṭṭha from the Coḷas, built many new monasteries at Polonnaruva and restored some in the outlying provinces, made no attempt to repair these shrines which were the most sacred to the Buddhists. The Cūlavaṃsa tries to explain this by saying that they had not been restored by previous kings 'becauee it was so difficult'.[4] In spite of the testimony of the chronicles, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the decay of some of these shrines would have been the result of neglect during the troubled period preceding the accession of Parakkamabāhu I rather than of wilful destruction at the hands of the Coḷas. It would, therefore, be rash to contend that the restoration of shrines and monasteries undertaken after the restitution of Sinhalese power represents a policy of persecution of Buddhism by militant Hindus.

---

[1] ARASC 1946 p.15; 1951 p.17.

[2] Cv 78.96-104; Archaeological evidence suggests that the Lohapāsāda was rebuilt after a long period of desolation. ARASC 1949 p.11.

[3] Pjv., p.166.

[4] Cv., 78.-96-97; Cv. trsl. Vol. II p.113.

Though examples of conversion of Buddhist vihāras into Hindu shrines are met with, as at Buddhannehäla,[1] it does not necessarily follow that these represent the work of the Coḷas. For, they could more probably belong to the reign of Māgha who, as the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya claim, made a determined attempt to convert Buddhists to an alien faith.[2]

Godakumbura, in his description of the ruins at Padaviya, remarks that 'the occurrence of remains of Śiva temples among the Buddhist monuments or above their foundations has to be attributed to the Coḷa invasion of the eleventh century (sic).'[3] A number of Tamil inscriptions datable to the tenth and eleventh centuries, among them two from the reign of Rājarāja, were found by a Śiva Devale at the site. Yet, even if the Śiva temples were built over the foundations of 'Buddhist monuments' as Godakumbura has suggested it seems more advisable to refrain from concluding that they represent evidence of suppression of Buddhism by the Coḷas. It is quite possible that the Hindu shrines were located on abandoned and dilapidated Buddhists shrines. Secondly, it is not possible to reliably identify the exact character of a building from the remains of its foundations. On the other hand, the ruins as preserved into our times reveal both Buddhist and Hindu shrines which had existed side by side. A slab found near the dāgäba of the Buddhist shrine bears a Sanskrit inscription of the 12th or the 13th century which records that a

---

[1] ASC, Seventh Progress Report, Sessional Papers 1896, p.30.

[2] Cv., 80.65-68, 75-79; Pjv., pp. 108-109.

[3] ARASC 1963 p.67.

Buddhist monastery named Laṅkātilaka was taken under the protection of the Velaikkāras, the Tamil mercenaries.[1] Hence no definite evidence seems to be available to lend support to the suggestion that the Buddhist monastery at Padaviya was destroyed by the Coḷas.

In this context, it is rather significant that there were Buddhists among the Tamils. There are some, though rare, instances of patronage of of Buddhist shrines by even the Coḷa kings who, avowedly, were devoted Hindus.[2] Instances of patronage of Buddhist institutions by Tamils in Ceylon are found in a number of inscriptions spread over a wide area from Velgama, Anurādhapura, Polonnaruva, Moragahavela, Paṅḍuvasnuvara and Paraṅgivīdiya to Miyankaṅḍura.[3] A Tamil inscription dated in the reign of a certain Senavarman records the patronage extended by the Tamils in Ceylon to a Buddhist vihāra called Mākkoḍaipaḷḷi.[4] The record probably dates from the ninth or the tenth century. Of all these inscriptions, those from Velgama are of particular interest as they reveal that Buddhist institutions were actively patronized by members of the Tamil community even during the period of Coḷa occupation. It is possible that this Buddhist monastery was named Rājarājaperumpalli as it was patronized by the Coḷa king. But no donations made by the Coḷa royalty occur in the inscriptions at the site.

---

[1] ARASC 1953, no.19.

[2] See the Leiden plates, EI Vol. XXII pp.213-284.

[3] ASC, Seventh Progress Report, Sessional Papers 1896,p.57; ARASC 1909 p.26, 1951 no.19, 1952 no.17, 1953 nos. 6, 19-21; CJSG Vol. II p.199 no.596; UCR Vol. XVIII pp.46-9. SII Vol. IV Nos. 1405, 1410.

[4] South Indian Inscriptions Vol. IV No. 1405.

This is the only instance of a Buddhist monastery being patronized during the period of Coḷa rule. It is not impossible that the reason which attracted patronage was the presence at the institution of Tamil speaking monks who could cater to the religious needs of the Buddhists among the Tamil community.[1] In this connection, it is noteworthy that the Cūlavaṃsa mentions a certain Velagāmi monastery as one of the shrines repaired by Vijayabāhu I.[2] If this is identified with the Velgamvehera, as Nicholas has suggested,[3] it would be another instance which exemplifies the dangers involved in drawing conclusions on the religious policy of the Coḷas from evidence on restorative work undertaken by Vijayabāhu I.

Nevertheless, the deposal of the Sinhalese dynasty and the probable deprivation of the gubernatorial hierarchy that the Coḷa conquest brought about removed the sources of patronage that sustained the saṅgha. Buddhist monasteries suffered from neglect and predatory raids during campaigns. One could surmise that the estates of the saṅgha were also affected; but there is no specific evidence of confiscation.[4] There is reason to believe that these conditions led to emigration of monks to foreign lands.[5] Under such circumstances it is but natural that the saṅgha would have welcomed

---

[1] See also p.4-52.

[2] Cv., 60.62.

[3] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.45.

[4] See p.117.

[5] See p.399.

the restitution of Sinhalese power over Rājaraṭṭha; but there is no evidence for the contention that the saṅgha became 'a potent nationalist and political power' during the struggle against the Colas.[1]

The influence of Śaivism lingered on after the period of Cola rule. The Cūlavaṃsa mentions that Vijayabāhu I did not withdraw the grants which had been formerly made to shrines of gods (devakula).[2] He seems to have even patronized a Śaiva shrine. A temple in the Kantalai district bore his name.[3] Presumably, his son Vikkamabāhu was more devoted to the Śaiva faith. He confiscated property of the saṅgha; but an inscription from Budumuttāva, dated in his reign, implies that he patronized Śaivism as it mentions a Śaiva shrine named after him.[4] This was continued by Gajabāhu II who, according to the Cūlavaṃsa,'fetched nobles of heretical faith (pāpadiṭṭhino) from abroad and had Rājaraṭṭha filled with the briers (of heresy)'.[5] Tamil tradition claims that he was converted to Śaivism.[6] The partiality of these last two kings towards Śaivism would have vitiated the traditional relationship between the saṅgha and the king. It was only in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I that the patronage of the saṅgha was resumed on a generous scale.

---

[1] D. T. Devendra, Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, fascicule A-Aca p.22. Cf W. M. K. Wijetunga, The rise and decline of Cola power in Ceylon (unpublished thesis Ph.D. 1962) p.322.

[2] Cv., 60.77.

[3] EZ Vol. IV pp.191-196.

[4] EZ Vol. II pp.302-312.

[5] Cv., 70.53-54.

[6] Śri Dakṣiṇa Purāṇam (ed. Vaittiyaliṅga Deśihar, 1916) Pt. II p.20. Trikoṇasala Purāṇam (ed. Śaṇmugaratna Aiyar, 1909) pp.170, 178. I am indebted to Mr. K. Indrapala for this information.

The relationship between the saṅgha and the king which enhanced the king's position in the eyes of the people would also add importance to the position of the saṅgha. Their support was important for the king. As religious preceptors and men of letters they held a prominent and influential position in the society. This very role gained for some individual monks access to the royal family and influence with the king. It is evident from the Mahāvaṃsa that Goṭhābhaya (249-262 A.D.) who was impressed by the erudition and wisdom of Saṅghamitta entrusted the education of his two sons to him.[1] Mahāsena, who later became king, was a devoted follower of this monk. Aggabodhi VIII (804-815) built the Bhūta Parivena for his teacher (sakācariya) and his retinue of three hundred monks.[2] At least two kings from the period under consideration were deeply versed in the teachings of Theravāda Buddhism. Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) wrote the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gätapadaya, a Sinhalese commentary on the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā.[3] In his slab inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery, he claims to have expounded the works on Abhidhamma in the presence of his teacher and to have 'extolled the virtues of the Buddha in the Sinhalese language'.[4] According to the Cūlavaṃsa he often read the Tipiṭaka and used to preach the Abhidhamma 'in the manner of a buddha (buddhalīlāya)' to the monks of the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery.[5] Simi-

[1] Mv., 36.114-117.

[2] Cv., 49.46.

[3] DAG . p.295.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.47 ll.11-12.

[5] Cv 52.48, 82.

larly Sena IV (954-956) was wont to explain the canonical text to the monks of the three nikāyas who came to listen to him at the Lohapāsāda.[1] Kassapa's teacher, presumably, was a monk. The deep knowledge of the Theravāda that these kings possessed and the esteem in which their learning was held even by the monks would suggest the probability of their having had a long period of monastic training. In the Polonnaruva inscription of Vijayabāhu I, Mugalan of the Uturoḷamuḷa fraternity is described as rājaguru.[2] This may imply that he was either the teacher or the personal preceptor of the king.

The influential position that monks held as preceptors and teachers which gained them access to the king could be put to important political use. Monks were sometimes counsellors of kings.[3] Yet it is to the role of mediators that their position suited them most. Not only did they have easy access to both the parties but also they could be certain of getting a respectful hearing. This position accorded to the saṅgha considerable influence in political affairs particularly in times when the Island was divided. The monks of the three nikāyas accompanied yuvarāja Mahinda, who had been forced to flee to Malaya after incurring the displeasure of Sena II, when he came back to seek reconciliation with the king.[4] They intervened with success again in the time of Kassapa IV. Ādipāda

[1] Cv., 54.4.

[2] EI Vol. XVIII p.337 l.26.

[3] CV., 57.23.

[4] Cv., 51.14.

Mahinda, the ruler of Rohaṇa, had rebelled against the king and defeated the royal army. However, his father, yuvarāja Kassapa, persuaded him to give up his intentions to capture the throne. Laterpen, Mahinda was faced with a rebellion within his own province and was forced to solicit the support of the king. The monks interceded on his behalf and it was through their mediation that friendly relations between him and the king, leading to his marriage to the king's daughter, were restored.[1] After the incident at Tapovana[2] Udaya III (887-898 A.D.) faced a critical situation when he found himself powerless to control the army and the citizens of Anurādhapura who had risen in revolt. Here again, it was the monks who intervened to pacify the troops and save the situation for the king. Māṇābharaṇa of Rohaṇa, who fought a series of campaigns against Gajabāhu II during the course of his struggle for the throne of Polonnaruva, went to see the latter in the company of monks when he decided to give up hostilities and enter into a friendly pact with him.[3]

In certain instances, monks served the king as emissaries. When the rebel prince Parakkamabāhu returned to the kingdom of his stepfather Kittisirimegha after his sojourns in the neighbouring kingdom, the latter sent the head of the kuṭṭharasabhā and Abhaya, the abbot of the Pañca-parivaṇamūla, as emissaries to persuade him to come back to the capital.[4]

---

[1] Cv., 52.4-9.

[2] See p. 296.

[3] Cv., 70.179-181.

[4] Cv., 67.60-61.

Gajabāhu II, desperate in his losing struggle against Parakkamabāhu who had defeated his troops in several engagements, saw no other alternative but to solicit the intervention of the monks of the three nikāyas. According to the Cūlavaṃsa[1] the monks visited Parakkamabāhu in his camp at Giriṭaṭāka and prevailed upon him to cease hostilities. They convinced him that before long he could claim the kingdom on the death of Gajabāhu who was without offspring and advanced in age. Apparently, Parakkamabāhu, too, realized the advantages of biding his time 'at the request of the saṅgha'. For this assurance would strengthen his claims to the throne of Polonnaruva as against the rival claims of Mānābharaṇa of Rohaṇa. A treaty of friendship in which the kingdom was bequeathed to Parakkamabāhu was indited at the Maṇḍalagiri monastery. This record has not been found. Nevertheless, the historicityof this important incident is attested to by an inscription found at a monastery in Saṃgamuva in the Hāṭahaya Korale of the Kurunāgala district.[2] In this edict, Gajabāhu and Parakkamabāhu enter into a pact of friendship and non-aggression. Each nominates the other as his successor and heir to the kingdom. Obviously, this arrangement was in favour of Parakkamabāhu, the younger ruler. At the end they solemnly state that if any of them were to violate these conditions, it would be tantamount to a breach of the orders of the saṅgha. It is significant that the edicts were placed within the premises of monasteries. Perhaps, the location was

[1] Cv., 70.328-336; 71.1-5.

[2] EZ Vol. IV pp.1-8.

expected to sanctify the solemn undertaking given by the princes. It is also possible that this reflects the important role the monks played in accomplishing this delicate political mission.

The diplomatic skill of the monks would have been most useful in maintaining relations with other Buddhist rulers in countries like Burma. No definite evidence is available to enable us to determine whether the envoys and emissaries exchanged between the two countries included monks. Of the emissaries sent by Parakkamabāhu to the Burmese court, it is possible that ācariya Vācissara was a monk.[1] It is noteworthy that the Burmese envoy was called Tapassin.[2] It is more certain that monks played an active part in restoring friendly relations between the two countries after the outbreak of hostilities in the time of Parakkamabāhu. According to the chronicles, it was to the saṅgha that the Burmese wrote requesting intercession; the monks succeeded in persuading Parakkamabāhu to cease hostilities.[3]

It is evident from our discussion that the power and the influence of the king and the saṅgha were complementary and were used to serve their mutual interests. Geiger rightly pointed out that the interests of the saṅgha and the king were closely knitted together: 'The kingship by which the state was represented was the firmest support of the Buddhist church and the latter that of kingship.'[4] However, it would be a misleading over-

[1] Cv., 76.32.

[2] Cv., 76.23.

[3] CV., 76.59-75.

[4] CCMT. p.203.

simplification and a distortion of facts to state that there was no friction between the state and the saṅgha on matters other than the religious.[1] Preservation of their property and privileges would have been important considerations which guided the saṅgha in their relations with the king. The grants of immunity made during this period left the relative limits of the authority of the monastic and the temporal administrations largely indeterminate. This was a situation which could easily lead to friction.

In the tenth century the rights of the Isuramenu monastery to water from the Tisā tank led to a dispute between the employees of the monastery and the royal officials. As mentioned earlier, the monks appealed to the king, identified as Mahinda IV, who, in an edict issued in his ninth regnal year, gave his decision in favour of the monastery.[2] A more serious confrontation with the king himself had taken place in the reign of Udaya III, when the rights of the monastery to give asylum (abhaya) to men wanted by the law seem to have been challenged. Certain ministers of the king fled from his court and sought refuge in the Tapovana where the Paṃsukūlikas lived. The king went to the Tapovana with his uparāja and had the fugitives executed. The facts that the king took a personal interest in the affair and that the offenders were put to death suggest that they had committed a rather grave offence. Yet, the monks took umbrage at the conduct of the king which they, presumably, considered to be a breach of their privileges

[1] Rāhula, op.cit., p.69.

[2] Vessagiri Inscriptions, Slab A, EZ Vol. I pp.29-38; see p.95-96.

and left for Rohaṇa in protest. This roused the army and the citizens of Anurādhapura to such an extent that they rose in revolt, killed the officials responsible for the incident, threatened the king and forced the yuvarāja and the ādipāda to run after the monks to implore them to return. Ironically enough, it was by seeking refuge in a monastic residence that a king escaped the wrath of the rebels; and it was after the intervention of the monks that the rebels were pacified.[1] The king was humiliated before his people and constrained into begging the Pāṃsukūlikas to pardon him. The rights of the saṅgha were vindicated in a most dramatic manner. The incident reveals not only that the monks were conscious of their 'secular' rights and ready to defend them but also that the people were convinced that this was right and proper. Above all, it demonstrated that the goodwill of the king was not always necessary to preserve the privileges and the position of the saṅgha.

When examined in the context of this incident, immunities granted in an inscription from Giritale, dated in the first regnal year of this king, acquire a new significance. It declares that officials were not to enter the land to arrest offenders; but a new provision is added. It was specifically mentioned that traitors to the royal family were not to be given asylum within the land.[2]

It is perhaps a similar incident that is referred to in two strophes in the account of the reign of Vijayabāhu I in the Cūlavaṃsa:

---

[1] Cv., 53.14-27.

[2] ...radolaṭ piṭatun gämä tā norakṇā isā... EZ Vol. III p.140 ll.C30-32.

vihārābhayacārittabhedinim mahisim sakam
parihāre sabbaso chijja gāhayitvā galamhi tam
puramhā bahi kāretvā mahāsaṅgham khamāpayi
pakāsesi ca lokassa saṅghagāravam attano[1]

'His own queen who had violated the immunity rights of the monasteries, he divested of her privileges and had her led by the neck and evicted from the city. Thus he conciliated the mahāsaṅgha and demonstrated to the world his reverence for the saṅgha.'[2] It was an unprecedented step that the king took in levying such a severe penalty on his own queen. In fact, it is unique in the annals of Ceylon. There is no indication of the exact nature of the offence committed by her; but there is no doubt that she was considered to be guilty of a severe breach of privileges of the monasteries. Vijayabāhu I had two queens both of whom were foreigners. Tilokasundarī was from Kalinga. Līlāvatī who had lived in the Cola country was a daughter of Jagatipāla, a prince from Ayojjhā. It is possible that they were not Buddhists. The public disgrace of the queen for interfering with the rights of the saṅgha is a graphic illustration of the power and the influence of the saṅgha and the need of the king to placate them.

---

[1] Cv., 60.54-56.

[2] Geiger translated vihārābhayacāritta as 'peaceful life of the vihāras'; abhayacāritta (Cf. sirit in inscriptions. supra p. 258.) seems to carry a more specialised sence in this context. He is inaccurate in translating puramhā bahi kāretvā as 'had her led out into the town'. Further, no mention of an 'iron collar' as given in his translation is evident in this passage. See Cv., trsl. Vol. I p.219. Nicholas follows Geiger's translation UHC Vol. I pt. II p.431.

The Abhayagiri inscription of Kassapa V, as pointed out earlier, claims that kingship was an office conferred by the saṅgha. Sometimes, kingship or the royal insignia were offered to the saṅgha by the kings as a token of their submission.[1] The saṅgha was consulted in certain instances in the selection of heirs and successors. We cannot be certain, however, whether this was a customary procedure. It is possible that, at least in some of these cases, they were invited on consideration of the political value of their support in cases of disputable succession. On the death of Saddhātissa (137-119 B.C.), the courtiers assembled the monks and sought their assent to the appointment of Thūlatthana to the throne, overlooking the rights of the eldest son, Lañjatissa.[2] When uparāja Virabāhu died, Vijayabāhu I consulted the monks and followed their advice in appointing Jayabāhu to that position.[3]

The most significant convention for choosing a successor in which the monks participated took place on the death of Vijayabāhu I. The news of the death of the king was not conveyed to his son Vikkamabāhu who was the governor of Rohaṇa. The monks of the leading fraternities (āyatana) and the high dignitaries of the kingdom took counsel with Mittā, the sister of the king, and her three sons and decided on consecrating Jayabāhu as king. Then they ignored the rights of Vikkamabāhu in nominating Mānābharaṇa,[a] son of

[1] Mv., 32.36; 31.90,111. Cv., 39.31; 42.61; 82.30; 85.109.

[2] Mv., 33.17-18.

[3] Cv., 60.87.

Mittā, as the uparāja. It is significant that the author of the Cūlavaṃsa, though a monk himself, criticizes this act for which the saṅgha was partly responsible as a violation of customary procedure.[1] The monks would have had their own reasons for the decision. Nevertheless, this injudicious association with a highly disputable decision proved to be as disastrous for the saṅgha as it was for the kingdom. It led to a protracted struggle for the throne and resulted in the division of the Island into three rival kingdoms. The influence of the saṅgha over the king fell low on the capture of the throne of Polonnaruva by Vikkamabāhu. The saṅgha now turned to a new direction for protection. Mugalan, the abbot of the Utarola-mula, handed over the protection of his fraternity and its property to the Velaikkāra mercenaries.[2] The precautions proved to be of no avail. Vikkamabāhu confiscated their property. In a concerted act of protest, the inmates of all the major monasteries of Polonnaruva left the capital for Rohaṇa, carrying with them the most sacred relics in the Island - the Tooth relic and the Alms Bowl.[3] But this time they were not popular enough to rouse the people to revolt in sympathy.

The long period of contiguous existence of the saṅgha and the state had led to the development of a close relationship between the two institutions and the evolution of many ideas of mutual benefit. One of the

---

[1] ...pubbacārittamaggaṃ laṅghitvā... Cv., 61.1-4; The phrase yatayo tathayatanavasino was translated by Geiger as 'the ascetics dwelling in the district'. Cv trsl. Vol. I p.225.

[2] EI. Vol. XVIII pp. 330-338; see p.122.

[3] Cv., 61.54-61; see also p.126.

politically most potent ideas to emerge from this relationship was the notion that only a Buddhist, nay a Bodhisattva, could become king of Ceylon. The Sinhalese kings who occupied the throne during the period under discussion claimed not merely to be Buddhists; they traced back their descent to the family of the Buddha. The position of the king was 'legitimized' and strengthened by the sanction of the saṅgha and raised to the highest place in the Buddhist lay order. In practice, the king was the chief patron of the saṅgha. He could and did intervene to settle disputes among the saṅgha, to set up regulations for the administration of monasteries and to initiate 'purifications' in times of lapses in discipline. On the other hand, it was held that the Island belonged to the sāsana; it was the saṅgha who invested the king with his authority. From about the ninth century extensive administrative powers were transferred to the monasteries over their estates and villages. It is noticeable that there was some hesitation over the transfer of judicial rights; the attempts of the kings to assert their authority in this field would sometimes lead to disputes. But on the whole the monastery had extensive authority and controlling power over the inhabitants of its estates. Presumably the saṅgha wielded considerable political influence through their personal contact with kings; this was particularly strong in times of political disunity and in cases of disputed successions. And outside China, it was only in Ceylon that the Buddhist saṅgha had sufficient power and influence to challenge the king in defence of their privileges. At least once, they did so successfully.

Chapter 6

CULTS AND RITUAL

Buddhism which offered a path to salvation through personal endeavour and had no cultus to cater to the 'specific plebian religious needs'[1] of the society did not demand from its followers the complete rejection of non-Buddhist cultic practices. Even during the early years of its history, it came to terms with popular cults like the propitiation of yakkhas and nāgas and the worship of Brahmanical gods. Buddhist texts merely claim that the yakkhas, nāgas and the devas accepted the supremacy of the Buddha. In Ceylon, some of the pre-Buddhist cults had been appended to Buddhism by the beginning of the period under consideration. This did not necessitate any change in its fundamental principles. In some cases, 'Buddhist' rites were introduced to perform the functions of pre-Buddhist practices. On the other hand, thecontact with the Mahāyāna, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava faiths stimulated the development within Sinhalese Buddhism of cultic practices and elaborate ceremonial. Together, these trends represent the development of Sinhalese Buddhism into a comprehensive religious system capable of serving the varied religious needs of the society.

Myths and legends concerning the early history of the Island reveal the influence that the cult of the yakkhas had on the life and thoughts of the people.[2] Yakkhas, both benevolent and malevolent, find mention in the chronicles and other literary works. The Mahāvaṃsa speaks of the twenty-

---

[1] I have borrowed the term from Weber. See The religions of India 1958 p. 237.

[2] Mv., ch. I, VII.

eight chief yakkhas who stood guard at the ceremony of enshrining relics at the Mahāthūpa to ward off malevolent (duṭṭha) yakkhas. And in the account of the reign of Paṇḍukābhaya, the chronicle refers to the cult of the yakkhas Citta, Kālavela and Maheja and the yakkhinīs Cittā and Cetiyā.[1]

Jayasena, the yakkha mentioned in a story in the Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa,[2] seems to have belonged to the malevolent type. According to this story which clearly reflects the belief in the maleficent influence of the yakkhas, a concubine of Goṭhayimbara, the general of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī, was 'possessed' by Jayasena. She fell on the ground unconscious; white froth formed at her mouth and she began to roll on the ground with her eyes swivelling in their sockets. It is natural to expect that the Buddhist monks who were drawn from a society which believed in the influence of yakkhas would ensure the persistence of these beliefs even within the community of monks. This is evident in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī which prescribes measures to be taken if a monk were to be 'possessed' by a yakkha.[3] Goṭ-hayimbara cured his concubine by challenging Jayasena and killing him in a duel. But lesser mortals preferred to propitiate such malevolent spirits with sacrifices. The Butasaraṇa makes an incidental reference to the prac-tice of sacrificing cocks to yakkhas to cure the afflictions of the ailing.[4]

---

[1] Mv., 9.23; 10.53-63, 66-69, 84-87, 90. See also Paranavitana, 'Pre-Buddhist religious beliefs in Ceylon', JRASCB Vol. XXXI pp. 302-328.

[2] Shsvp., p.97.

[3] Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (PTS) Vol. III pp. 969-970.

[4] leḍa tenättavuṭa śānti piṇisa yakhaṭa dun kukuḷu billak sē. Butsaraṇa (Sorata), 1931, p.264.

The Saddharmaratnāvaliya, a later work, also speaks of rituals which were performed to propitiate the yakkhas.[1]

One means of reconciling Buddhism with the yakkha cult was to claim that some of the yakkhas were followers of the faith. As pointed out earlier, the twenty-eight chiefs of the yakkhas stood guard at the Mahāthūpa. A slab inscription of Mahinda IV (956-972 A.D.) found in the Isurumuni area speaks of the rākṣasa of the Tissa tank who had been 'disciplined' by the thera Mahinda and 'employed in the service of the Order and the World'.[2] On the other hand, an attempt was made to present Buddhism as a potent magical force which could overcome the power of the malevolent yakkhas. This attitude finds precedents in the Pali canonical literature. The Ālavaka Sutta,[3] for instance, deals with the subjugation and conversion of a powerful yakkha by the Buddha. According to the chronicles, the Island had been the home of yakkhas in the past. It was the Buddha who with his miraculous powers defeated them and drove them away to make it suitable for human habitation.[4] Devotion to the Buddha and the assiduous practice of his teachings made people immune to harm caused by yakkhas. In a story from the Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa,[5] a royal official and a sorcerer who tried to kill a pious merchant were themselves killed by the very evil spirit they invoked.

Further, 'Buddhist' rites were developed to replace the normal rites connected with the yakkha cult. Transfer of 'merit' takes the place of

---

[1] Saddharmaratnāvaliya (D.B.Jayatilaka), 1936, pp. 80, 89.

[2] anubudu maha Mihindu himiyan visin vinoyā sasun vāḍa lovāḍ̆hi yedū rakus EZ Vol. I p.33 ll.9-10.

[3] Saṃyutta Nikāya (PTS) Vol. I pp.212-215; Sāratthapakāstin (PTS) Vol. I pp. 316-337. See also J. Masson, La religion populaire dans le canon bouddhique pāli, Louvain, 1942, pp. 126-129.

[4] Mv. ch. I.

[5] Shsvp., p.145.

sacrifice and the buddhamanta replaces the incantation. According to the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, a man 'possessed' by an evil spirit could be cured by reciting the Metta, Dhajagga and the Ratana Sutta for seven days. If this should fail, the demoniac was to be escorted to the monastery and made to perform such 'merit-producing' functions as worshipping the āsana, lighting lamps and sweeping the courtyard of the stūpa. After this, the Maṅgala Sutta was to be recited for the benefit of the spirit. Then he was to be addressed in an assembly to which the tree-deity of the monastery was also invited. Here he should be informed of the merit transferred to his credit and requested to release the demoniac from his hold. If the yakkha was obstainate in his refusal to listen to the saṅgha, the Āṭānāṭiya Sutta was to be recited as an extreme and ultimate measure and appeals were to be made to the chief yakkhas and the deities informing them of his obstinacy. A monk who observed the rules of ceremonial purity by abstaining from both meat and food made from flour was to recite the sutta behind closed doors guarded by men bearing arms.[1]

The magical potentialities of the Āṭānāṭiya Sutta were recognized even in the Pali Canon.[2] Yet it was an incantation meant for the individual 'protection' of the monks, nuns and devotees. In the commentary it is developed into an elaborate rite which accords an exorcizing function to the Buddhist monk. It was perhaps an attempt to absorb the yakkha cult into

---

[1] Sumaṅgalavilāsinī Vol. III pp.969-970.

[2] Digha Nikaya (PTS) Vol. III pp.194-207. For studies on this sutta, see Przyulski and Lalou, 'Notes de mythologie bouddhique', Harvard Jnl. of As. Stud., 1938, pp.40-46.

the fold of Buddhist ritual. However, the evidence from the Butsarana cited above testifies to the persistence of the parallel practice of propitiating yakkhas with sacrifices. Moreover, it is possible to surmise that the latter practice found favour even among monks. The Dambadeni Katikāvata forbids monks to offer sacrifices to yakkhas or to take part in exorcism.[1]

In Buddhist literature, nāgas occur as powerful beings who were, nevertheless, subservient to the Buddha. At Uruvelā and later in the Cedi country, the Buddha subdued hostile nāgas.[2] Tales of nāgas occur prominently in the early legends about the visit of the Buddha to the Island found in the Dāpavaṃsa and the Mahāvaṃsa.[3] A legend in the Cūlavaṃsa mentions a rite connected with the nāga cult performed at Gokaṇṇa by a certain Mahānāga who lived in the sixth century to ensure his accession to the throne.[4]

As would be expected, the nāga cult seems to have been closely connected with water; many of the nāgas have been found near ponds and reservoirs. A figure of a nāga was found by the Vannamaḍuva reservoir. Close to the reservoir is a semi-circular pond by which another figure of a nāga and 'a single figure of a goddess' are cut on the rock.[5] At Morakanda, a

---

[1] upan rōgaya nisā yakun kelavīm balitibīm balibat kiyavīm ādi nosarup dā nokaṭa yutu. Katikāvat Saṅgara (D. B. Jayatilaka), 1955 p.19.

[2] Vinaya Piṭaka (PTS) Vol. I pp. 24-25; Vol. IV pp. 108-110.

[3] Dv., ch. II; Mv., ch. I.

[4] Cv., 41.79-82.

[5] ARASC 1897 p.8.

nāga carved in the round is placed in such a manner that it seems to emerge from the stream where it is found.[1] Perhaps the most elaborate specimenof this type of sculpture is the anthropomorphic representation of a nāga on a slab found on the bund of a tank at Gal Oya. He wears a crown which is shielded by a seven-headed hood. To his right is a dimunitive nāginī with a prominent śaṅkha symbol above her. Another feminine figure stands on his left. She holds a śaṅkha with her right hand and is attended by a child. On either side of his head, there is an attendant figure in a 'flying' posture.[2] The location of the sculpture and the śaṅkha symbols which appear on it strengthen the probability of its connection with water.

It is natural to expect that in an agricultural society, the cult of spirits connected with water would acquire the important magical function of making rain. Evidence on this subject is meagre. The Mahābhārata stdes that one of the blessings that Maṇināga conferred on Magadha where he was worshipped was to attract clouds to this area.[3] Hiuen-tsang speaks of the shrine of the nāgarāja Elapātra at Taxila where people used to pray for rain or fine weather.[4] If this interpretation is accepted, one may surmise that by erecting figures of nāgas by reservoirs and honouring them, the devotees of this cult expected to ensure their supply of water.

Apart from their association with water, nāgas are known in Indian

---

[1] ARASC 1897 p.7.

[2] ARASC 1953 pl. IX.

[3] See p.312.

[4] Beal, op.cit., Vol. II p.180; For further discussion on the connection of the Nāga-cult with water and rain, see J. Ph. Vogel, Indian Serpent-lore or the Nāgas in Hindu legend and art, 1926, pp. 240-242, 251-256.

literature as guardians of treasures, particularly jewels.[1] It is probably in this role that they occur frequently in monastic precincts. Figures of nāgas, both anthropomorphic and theriomorphic, occur on the stelae of the stūpas at Jetavanārāma and Cetiyagiri.[2] They occur more often on the guardstones of the late-Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva periods. A rather unusual figurine of a twenty-one-headed nāga was found in the relic chamber of a stūpa near the Tōpāvāva. Beneath the relic chamber was a yantragala which contained forty-five figurines of nāgas in nine 'family groups'.[3] None of these sculptures appear to have served a cultic purpose.

Nāgas are given more importance in certain sculptured slabs found by Buddhist shrines. One of the most striking examples is a slab about four feet in height found at the Jetavanārāma. On it is an imposing figure of a seven-headed nāga. He wears a band below his head and lies coiled beneath a chatra. He is flanked by pilasters which support a band decorated with 'Buddhist windows'.[4] A similar slab from Polonnaruva has a five-headed nāga seated under a chatra. He is attended by two figures seated on short pillar-like supports on either side.[4] These slabs give the impression that they were used for a cultic purpose. An instance of

---

[1] Vogel, op.cit., pp. 131-132, 173-174.

[2] UHC Vol. I Pt. I pls. VIII, IX, X.

[3] ARASC 1909 p.29 pl. LXVI. A. K. Coomaraswamy, Bronzes from Ceylon, 1914, pl. XX fig. 87. For the more recent discoveries at Padaviya see also ARASC 1954 pp.16-20.

[4] UHC Vol. I Pt. I pl. VIIIb; ASC Eleventh Report pl. X; ARASC 1894 pl. VIIc; CJSG Vol. II p.98, pl. LVII.

the reconciliation of Indian Buddhism with the nāga cult is recorded by Sung-yun who saw at Udyāna a Buddhist monastery situated by a lake which was 'occupied' by a nāga king: 'The king of the country propitiates him with gold and jewels and other precious offerings which he casts into the middle of the tank; such of these which find their way through a back exit, the priests are permitted to retain.' The monastery depended on this income for its expenses.[1] It is possible to imagine that in a similar manner, the nāga cult found a place in the Buddhist shrines of Ceylon, too.

An inscription found at a group of ruins to the east of the Abhayagiri monastery seems to support this surmise.[2] This record is dated in the reign of a certain Senavarman. There were five kings who bore this name in the ninth and tenth centuries. The record is written partly in Tamil and partly in Sanskrit and contains an endowment made to a Buddhist shrine by a group of Tamils, to meet the cost of a religious festival. It is interesting that the reference to the main image of the shrine is followed by a respectful reference to a nāga - śiṣṭanāga-nāraiyum. Presumably, it refers to a second image at the shrine, though the fragmentary nature of the record precludes a definite conclusion. The present writer is not aware of any other reference to a nāga by the name of Śiṣṭa. However, śiṣṭa is a title applicable to a nāga who had been 'disciplined'

---

[1] Beal, op.cit., Vol. I p.64.

[2] SII Vol. IV No. 1405.

or 'converted' to the faith.

A pond which is situated within the grounds of the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale is of particular interest in this connection. This pond, known as Nāgapokuṇa today, is presumably identical with the Nāgasoṇḍi built by Aggabodhi I.[1] It is notable for the prominent figure of a polycephalic nāga carved in such a manner that it seems to rise from its waters.[2] It is possible that this pond, like the lakes described in Chinese accounts, was used for a cultic purpose.

A statement in the Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV seems to support this inference. While allocating resources for the maintenance of monastic buildings, the inscription lists the income from offerings made by devotees to the dāge (relic shrine), maṅgul mahasala piḷimage (shrine of the Stone Image), mahaboy ge (shrine of the bo tree), nayindā and the Miṇiṇāldevdūn ge (the shrine of the goddess Miṇiṇāl).[3]

Paranavitana[4] has suggested that nayinda is derived from Skt. Nāthendra, an epithet of the bodhisattva Lokanātha. He believes that Miṇiṇāl is derived from Maṇiṇālā. This, being similar to Maṇipadma in meaning, is considered to be another name of Tārā. But the term nayinda does not occur in Sinhalese literature as an epithet of Lokanātha. The usual Sinhalese derivative from Nāthendra is Natiṅdu.[5] The term nayi is

---

[1] Cv., 42.28.

[2] ARASC 1962 pls. II, III.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 92-3 ll.A33-37.

[4] CJSG Vol. II p.57.

[5] Tisara sandeśaya vv. 62, 128; Kāvyaśekhara vv.15-24.

a common derivative from nāga and occurs in this sense in Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya,[1] a work contemporaneous with the inscriptions; nayinda is the Sinhalese equivalent of Skt. nāgendra. It is also noteworthy that inreferring to other shrines the term ge (house) is used.

Similarly, Maṇinātā is not known to occur in any Buddhist work as an epithet of Tārā. On the other hand, Nāt was a common name among Sinhalese women in the eighth and ninth centuries.[2] The suffixes -la and -l were, according to Paranavitana, 'frequently added to proper names, evidently to indicate respect, e.g. Mihidala (Mihida = P. Mahinda) Nāl (Nā = Skt. Nāga), Deval (Deva = Skt. Deva)...'[3] It is thus evident that in this case Paranavitana considers Nāl a derivative from the Skt. Nāga.[4] It seems to be more plausible to trace the derivation of Miṇinā̆l to Skt. Maṇināga (A hill in Rohaṇa was named after Maṇināga.[5]) The cult of a Maṇināga finds mention in the Mahābhārata.[6] In the description of Rājagṛha in the Sabhāparvan of the epic, Kṛṣna refers to him: '...here is the excellent abode of Svastika and of Maṇi-nāga. Manu (Maṇi?) hath made Magadha such that clouds cannot keep aloof from it.' He is again mentioned

---

[1] DAG p.249.

[2] Paranavitana, Sīgiri Graffiti vv.93, 95, 165, 543, 608, 627.

[3] Ibid., Vol. I p.cxxiii.

[4] Maṇināga > MIṇinā. The use of the title devdū is not unusual; nāgas were known as bhummadevatā. In Bengal, the cult of the nāgī was absorbed into Buddhism in the worship of Jāṅguli. See N. K. Bhattasali, Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanic sculptures in the Dacca Museum, 1929, p.224; B. Bhattacarya, Indian Buddhist Iconography, 1924, pp. 78-80.

[5] Mv., 34.89.

[6] Mbh. Sabhāp. 21.9-10; Vanap. 84.106-7.

in the Vanaparvan in association with the city of Rājagṛha: 'Going thence to Maṇināga, one will reap a benefit equal to a gift of thousand kine. Whosoever partakes of the water of the tīrtha of Maṇināga, had he been bitten even by a venomous snake, the poison will have no effect on him.' The excavations carried out by Marshall and Bloch[1] at the shrine of Maniār Maṭh in Rājagṛha revealed a circular structure decorated with stucco figures datable, on stylistic grounds, to the Gupta period. They include five figures of nāgas and one of a nāginī. This points to the possibility of a nāginī associated with the cult of Maṇi and strengthens the probability that a nāginī who bore the name Maṇi found devotees in Ceylon.

Two figurines from the Leslie de Saram Collection in the Colombo Museum probably represent the cult of a nāginī. They were listed by Coomaraswamy as figures of Pattini. These identifications, however, are not certain as he himself admitted. Neither of the figures has any of the attributes of Pattini.[2] One is an erect figure which measures 22.5 cm.[3] The upper body of the figure is bare except for the ornaments and the upavīta. On the whole the dress and ornaments are comparable to those worn by the nāga figures on the guardstones. The figure holds a flower in either hand. It has a conical head-dress ornamented with cobra-hoods. A figure of a stūpa is found slightly above the forehead. A large hood of a

---

[1] ARASC 1905-6 pp. 103-106.

[2] A. K. Coomaraswamy, op.cit. p.12.

[3] Ibid., p.xvi, fig. 43.

cobra shields the head. The second figure is 13.3 cm. in height.[1] It represents a female figure sitting cross-legged on what appears to be the coils of a cobra which holds its hood over her head. The dress and ornaments are similar to those of the first figure though the stūpa symbol is missing. Both her hands are poised in the kaṭaka mudrā. The two figures have been dated, on stylistic grounds, to the 9th-10th centuries.

The continuance of this association of the nāga cult with Buddhism in the Polonnaruva period is reflected in the title of one of the senior monks invited by Parakkamabāhu I to particpate in the 'purification' of the saṅgha. Among those who came from the province of the yuvarāja was thera nāgindapalliya.[2] It does not seem likely that Nāgindapalliya was a name. On the other hand, the whole phrase could be rendered into English as the 'chief incumbent of the shrine of the nāga king'. It is evident from this passage that there was a well-known shrine of the nāgas in the Dakkhiṇadesa and that the incumbent at the time ranked high in the order of the saṅgha.

Evidence from both the chronicles and the inscriptions testify to the popularity of the Brāhmaṇas and Brāhmanic ritual during this period. Mahinda II (777-797) and Sena I (833-853) donated food to Brāhmaṇas.[3] In the reign of Sena II (853-887) their influence was strong enough to win

---

[1] A. K. Coomaraswamy, op.cit., pl. XVI, fig. 42.

[2] Cv., 78.9.

[3] Cv., 48.143-5; 50.5.

royal patronage on a grand scale. In a festival held in their honour, Sena fed a thousand Brāhmaṇas with milk-rice in jewelled bowls, clothed them in new garments and presented each with a golden vessel filled with pearls and a costly jewel placed at the top.[1] An inscription from the reign of Gajabāhu II reveals that Kantalāy was called Vijayarāja - caturvedi-maṅgalam;[2] presumably, there was a large number of Brāhmaṇas living there. Probably, it was named after Vijayabāhu I. This may suggest that the settlement was patronized by him. Another inscription from the same reign records the establishment of sacrificial boundaries by a royal official.[3] Parakkamabāhu I gave alms to Brāhmaṇas.[4] The Brāhmaṇa village at Kantalāy received royal patronage again in the time of Nissaṅka Malla. In an inscription found there he records that he sat at that spot watching the distribution of alms in the alms-hall he built in the Caturveda Brahmapura.[5] It is rather significant that the chronicle records instances of patronage of Brāhmaṇas without any apparent resentment. In fact, in this connection, Sena II is called puññavā, 'one who accumulated merit'.

The Cūlavaṃsa reveals that the kings of the Polonnaruva period employed Brāhmaṇas to perform rites prescribed by the Gṛhyasūtras and to interpret dreams and bodily marks.[6] According to the account of the early

[1] Cv., 51.65-67.

[2] EZ Vol. IV pp. 191-196.

[3] SII Vol. IV p.492 No. 1397.

[4] Cv., 73.32.

[5] EZ Vol. II pp.283-290.

[6] Cv., 62.28, 46-7.

life of Parakkamabāhu I, rites like Jātakamma, Kaṇṇavedha, Annapāsana, Medhajanana, Nāmakaraṇa and Upanayana were held strictly according to Brahmanic rules.[1] Parakkamabāhu I built a hall called Hemamandira for the ceremonies of expiation (santi) performed by Brāhmaṇas.[2] The navagrahaśānti that Nissaṅka Malla attended was probably a similar ceremony connected with the cult of planetary gods.[3]

However, these rites appear to have acquired 'Buddhist' characteristics and undergone modifications to suit the local needs. The ceremony of the first offering of food described in the story of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi in the Mahāvaṃsa has few Brahmanical characteristics.[4] It was preceded by an alms-giving and the children were fed with the left-overs from the food offered to monks. Similarly, the Upanayana rite of Parakkamabāhu was preceded by a Buddhist ceremony lasting three days during which the 'three jewels' were honoured with offerings of lamps and flowers.[5]

On the other hand, it is possible to believe that Brāhmaṇas were employed at Buddhist shrines for the performance of ritual functions. Fa-Hian mentions in his reference to the ceremonial concerning the Tooth relic that the king 'purified' himself 'according to the strictest Brāhmanical rules.[6] In the Ruvanvālisāya inscription of Kalyāṇavatī, Brāhmaṇas

[1] Cv., 62.42, 45, 53; 64.13-17.

[2] Cv., 73.71.

[3] EZ Vol. II pp. 146-8.

[4] Mv 24.74-77.

[5] Cv. 64.15-17.

[6] Beal, op.cit., p.47.

occur among the employees of the shrine.[1] Presumably, their presence was necessitated by ceremonial requirements. According to the Srei Santhor inscription of the Cambodian king Jayavarman V (968-1001), the purohita had to bathe an image of the Buddha and recite Buddhist 'prayers' on festival days.[2] A Burmese inscription from Pagan, dated in the twelfth century, mentions Brāhmaṇa astrologers as the functionaries who drew the water at an auspicious time for the performance of the paritta ceremony.[3] Probably, the Brāhmaṇas employed at the Ruvanvālisāya performed similar ceremonial functions.

Evidence of the rapprochement of Buddhism with the cults of Brahmanic gods is found even in the Pali canon. In the Mahāsamaya Sutta, they occur as followers of the Buddha who flocked to listen to his discourses.[4] In Ceylon, the cult of gods persisted side by side with Buddhism. Mahinda II restored decayed temples of gods and made images for them.[5] Parakkamabāhu I restored seventy-nine dilapidated shrines of gods and built thirteen new ones in Rajaraṭṭha; in Rohana, he repaired twenty-four shrines.[6] There is no evidence to determine the identity of these gods.[7] It has been suggested that the cults of Agni and Parjjuna were prevalent in the tenth

[1] EZ Vol. IV p.257 l.15.

[2] L. P. Briggs, 'The syncretism of religions in South East Asia', Jnl. Amer. Or. Soc. Vol. 71 Pt 4 p.241.

[3] Epig. Birm. Vol. III p.36.

[4] Dīgha nikāya (PTS) Vol. II pp. 253-263.

[5] Cv., 48.143-5.

[6] Cv., 79.19, 22, 80.

[7] Cv., 57.5-8.

century.[1] Other Brahmanic gods like Brahma, Sūrya and the Guardians of the Four Quarters were honoured in Ceylon. And the cults of tree-deities and local gods like Sumana and Vibhīsaṇa seem to have occupied a fairly important place in the life of the people.[2]

Apparently, Buddhism did not discourage the worship of gods. When the author of the Cūlavaṃsa says that Vijayabāhu I took nothing from the property of the shrines of gods, he is illustrating the good qualities of the king.[3] Nissaṅka Malla records that he built a devāla at Rāmeśvaram in an inscription placed at a Buddhist shrine.[4] The syncretic attitude of Buddhism led to the absorption of some of these cults into the fold of Buddhist ritual. Brahmanic gods adorn the stelae of the early stūpas at Anurādhapura. They also occur in the relic-chamber of stūpas and the yantragala receptacles found beneath the pedestals of images. A stūpa from Topāvāva yielded figures of Brahma, Varuṇa, Yama, Indra, Naiśrita, Agni and Viṣṇu.[5]

The reconciliation of these cults with Buddhism was probably based on the idea that these gods were followers of the Buddha. In fact Sumana, the god of Sumanakūṭa, was supposed to be a sotāpanna, one who had reached

---

[1] Art. As. Vol. XVI pp. 167-190.

[2] Mv. 1.33-36. See also the Mahmāyūrī JA, 1915, p.40.

[3] Cv., 60.77.

[4] EZ., Vol. II pp.98-123.

[5] ARASC., 1909 pp.17-18.

the initial stage of the path to salvation.[1] He became closely associated with Buddhism as the 'guardian of the Footprint of the Buddha'. A strophe in the Cūlavaṃsa which states that Kassapa of Rohaṇa 'built the Khadirāḷi monastery and honoured the god' suggests a possible connection between the cult of Khadirāḷi Uppalavaṇṇa and this monastery.[2] The Uturoḷa fraternity of the Abhayagiri nikāya seems to have had connections with the cult of Skanda.[3] But the most significant piece of evidence on the close association of Buddhism with the cult of gods comes from the account of the origin of the Selantara fraternity. The prospective chief incumbent of this fraternity was made to prove that his appointment had the approval of gods by spending a night in a devapalli. It is evidentfrom the Cūlavaṃsa that this practice was known even at the time the chronicle came to be written.[4]

The influence of Mahāyāna encouraged the development within Sinhalese Buddhist ritual of the practice of worshipping bodhisattvas. Reference to this cult occurs in the Cūlavaṃsa as early as in the time of Jeṭṭhatissa II (328-337 A.D.), the sculptor, who is said to have carved a figure of a bodhisattva.[5] Dhātusena had a complete set of regalia made for a figure of a bodhisattva he erected in a special shrine.[6] Sena II (833-853) erected

---

[1] Mv., 1.33.

[2] Khadirāḷivihāraṃ katvā devaṃ ca apūjayi. Cv., 45.55.

[3] See p. 425.

[4] See p. 446.

[5] Cv., 37.102.

[6] Cv., 38.67-68.

a bodhisattva figure in the Maṇimekhalā pāsāda at the Jetavana monastery.[1] In a tenth century inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery, a king claims to have gilded the image of the bodhisattva of the Blue Shrine at the monastery.[2]

The popularity of the cult of bodhisattvas is evident also from the sculptures found in different parts of the Island. The specimens from Buduruvegala which Paranavitana dates to about the ninth century are of particular interest. Here, the colossal statue of the Buddha is flanked by large figures of the bodhisattvas Avalokiteśvara and Mañjuśrī. Avalokiteśvara is attended by his śakti and a male figure while Mañjuśrī is attended by two male figures.[3] Another large figure in kingly attire from Väligama has been identified by Nell and Paranavitana as a representation of Avalokiteśvara.[4] Two more life-size figures of this divinity, dated by Mode to the latter half of the seventh century, have been found at Situlapavva and Kurukkalmadam.[5]

Three bronze figures in the Nevill collection of the British Museum and one in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts also attest to the popularity of Avalokiteśvara.[6] Almost equally frequent in occurrence are sculptures of Tārā. A large bronze figure in the British Museum measuring 143.75 cm. in height, a small figurine in the same collection which measures 13.3 cm. and two small figurines from the Anurādhapura Museum have been identified

[1] Cv., 51.77.

[2] EZ., Vol. I p.222 l.22.

[3] CJSG Vol. II pp.50-51; ARASC 1955 p.24.

[4] CJSG Vol. II pp.49-50.

(cont.)

as representations of this deity.[1] Apart from these, bronze figures of Vajrasattva (?),[2] Vajrapāṇi, Jambhala and Cuṇḍā have been found in Ceylon.[3] Except for the figure of Vajrasattva(?) which has been dated to the 5th-6th centuries,[4] all the other bronze figures have been assigned, on considerations of style, to the period from the eighth to the tenth centuries. They seem to represent the wave of Mahāyāna influence which as evident from the other sources spread over Ceylon during this period.[5]

The cult of bodhisattvas was not confined to those nikāyas which overtly acquiesced in Mahāyāna influences. The bodhisattva Maitreya seems to have found favour with the followers of the Mahāvihāra. A figure of Maitreya was unearthed among the ruins of the Thūpārāma monastery at Anurādhapura.[6] Though not many figures of Maitreya have been found, the wide popularity of his cult is evident from certain records of this period which carry the warning that those who violated the regulations embodied therein would not be able to raise their hands in adoration even if Maitreya Buddha were to pass by their doors.[7] An account of Maitreya is found in the Dharmapradīpikā, a commentary on the Mahābodhivaṃsa, written during

---

(cont.)

[5] Heinz Mode, Die Buddhistische Plastik auf Ceylon, 1963, pp.100-101 pls. 161, 162, 163. Mode's dating is not based on clear evidence. The sculptures could be considerably later.

[6] For the dating and the descriptions of the characteristics of these images see A. K. Coomaraswamy, 'Mahāyāna Buddhist images from Ceylon and Java', JRAS 1909 pp. 283-297 pls. I figs. 1, 2, II figs. 1, 3; Memoirs of the Colombo Museum Series A No. 1, 1914 pp. 20-21; Catalogue of the Indian Collection in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1923, Pt. I p.81.

[1] Coomaraswamy wrongly identified the figures at the British Museum as representations of the goddess Pattini. See JRAS 1909 pp. 292-293 pl. III figs. 2, 3. They have been more recently identified as representations of Tārā. See e.g. P. L. Prematilleke, Religious architecture and sculpture of Ceylon (unpublished thesis) Vol. I pp. 240-242. See also ARASC 1957

(cont.)

this period.[1]

The parallel trends noticed above of 'borrowing' gods from the Mahāyāna and of 'converting' Brahmanic and local deities to Buddhism seem to have led to the formation of a Sinhalese Buddhist pantheon. Here the term pantheon can be used only in a limited sense as it is not clear whether the relative positions of these gods had been as yet worked out. But the concept of 'Buddhist deities' (bauddha dēvatāvan) appears in the Ruvanvälisäya inscription of Nissaṅka Malla. These 'Buddhist deities' afforded protection to those who regularly performed Buddhist rituals. Once they came to converse with Nissaṅka Malla whilst he was engaged in worshipping relics.[2] It seems to have become part of popular belief

---

(cont.) pl. VI fig. 1.

[2]D. T. Devendra, The Buddha image and Ceylon, 1957, p.239. Prematilleke, op.cit., Vol. I p.239, Vol. II pl. XCIV. It is difficult to determine whether this is a representation of Vajrasattva or of Vajrapāṇi. The figure wears a tall headdress and sits in the vīrāsana, a pose unusual for Vajrapāṇi. The vīrāsana is usually associated with the Buddha. On the other hand, it carries the vajra in the right hand but not the ghaṇṭā; Vajrasattva usually carries both the ghaṇṭā and the vajra.

[3]JRAS 1909 pp. 285, 228-290, 291-292 Pls. I figs. 3, 4; II fig. 1; Catalogue Ind. Col. Bos. Mus. Fine Arts pp. 82-84.

[4]Prematilleke, op.cit. Vol. I pp. 239-240.

[5]See p.411.

[6]Mem.Cbo.Mus. Ser. A No. 1 p.20 Pl. V fig. 9. The figure was dated by Coomaraswamy to the seventh century. Prematilleke prefers to date it to the 8th-10th centuries. Prematilleke, op.cit., pp. 235-236.

[7]See e.g. EZ. Vol. III p. 258 ll. B7-13. See also p.190 ll.20-21; p.265 l.46.

[1]Dharmapradīpikā (Dharmārāma, 1951) pp. 206-208.

[2]EZ Vol. II p.80 ll.28-32.

that these deities would protect the Island in times of calamity. According to the Mahāvaṃsa, the Buddha in his death-bed charged Sakka with the protection of the Island. Sakka entrusted this task to Uppalavaṇṇa.[1] The Pūjāvaliya and the Cūḷavaṃsa explain that the invasion of Māgha took place at a time when the powerful deities who protected the Island had become disinterested in their task owing to the many misdeeds committed by its inhabitants.[2]

The use of the term 'Buddhist deities' may imply a belief in the presence of deities who were not so friendly towards Buddhism. By the Polonnaruva period, Śaivism had become an important force with many adherents. It is possible that the rivalry which prevailed between Buddhists and the followers of Śiva in South India spread to Ceylon. Śaiva nāyanārs like Tiruñāṇaçampantar and Māṇikkavāçakar who were particularly associated with the militant attitude that Śaivism adopted towards Buddhism and Jainism were worshipped in Ceylon.[3] It is likely that the cult of the nāyanārs fostered a certain amount of enmity between the Buddhists and the Śaivists. Śiva occurs among the gods attending on the Buddha in the murals of the relic chamber of the Mahiyaṅgana stūpa.[4] But it is not very likely that there was a rapprochment between Buddhism and the worship of Śiva.

---

[1] Mv., 7.1-5.

[2] Pjv., p.108; Cv., 80.54-55.

[3] P. Arunachalam, 'Polonnaruva Bronzes and Śiva worship and symbolism', JRASCB Vol. XXIV pp. 221-222; C. Godakumbura, 'Bronzes from Polonnaruva', JRASCB(NS) Vol. VII Pt. II p.244.

[4] ARASC 1951 p.17-18.

In addition to the cultic practices which were brought within the folds of its ritual, Buddhism provided ceremonial and even magical practices to meet the religious needs of the people. The power of the Buddha and Buddhist rites were considered to be potent magical forces which could counter the adverse effects of even those calamities like plague, famine and drought. In the past, the legends claimed, the Buddha Kakusandha visited Ceylon and cured the inhabitants of the plague through his miraculous powers.[1] Kaṇāgamana came to the Island in a time of drought and famine and caused rain.[2]

Perhaps, the most popular rite in Buddhism was the recitation of the paritta. Paritta was supposed to be a charm which could be used for the personal protection of the individual. It was also an efficacious and potent rite which could serve the whole community by warding off danger of drought, bad harvest, illness and harms caused by evil spirits. In Burma, it was believed that even the worst crimes could be mitigated by the recitation of paritta.[3] As such it became an important rite in the life of the people. The knowledge of the section of the scriptures which contained the paritta was considered an essential prerequisite for admission to the Order.[4]

---

[1] Pjv., p.50.

[2] Pjv., p.52.

[3] M. Bode, The Pali literature of Burma p.12.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.48 l.38; Vol. III p.264 l.21.

The rite consisted of the recitation of prescribed suttas to charm thread and water. When used as a charm for personal protection the water was sprinkled on the body and the thread worn. The Telapatta Jātaka refers to the use of charmed sand and thread to secure protection from yakkhas.[1] According to the Mahāvamsa, the god Uppalavaṇṇa came to meet Vijaya and his followers when they landed on the Island. He sprinkled them with water from his vessel and tied a charmed thread round their arms. Later on, the chronicle says, one of them was caught by a yakkhinī:'But because of the power of the magic thread (paritta sutta) she could not devour him, and though he was entreated by the yakkhinī, the man would not yield up the thread'.[2] The Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, as mentioned earlier, commends the paritta as a charm against evil spirits. Mānābharaṇa held a paritta recital when he heard that his queen had conceived.[3] Parakkamabāhu I built a mansion called Pañcasattati specifically for the recitation of paritta to charm thread and water.[4]

Kings held paritta recitals on a grand scale in times of grave calamity. The Cūlavamsa describes the performance of this rite in the reign of Upatissa I (365-406 A.D.) when the land was ravaged by famine and plague. Monks walked round the wall of the inner city throughout the night chanting

---

[1] Fausboll, Jātaka Vol. I p.39.

[2] Mv., 7.6-9, 14.

[3] Cv., 62.31,34.

[4] Cv., 73.73.

the Ratana Sutta and sprinkling water. This was done in accordance with the way the Buddha is said to have charmed the city of Vesāli against famine and illness. This combination of incantations and what seems to be sympathetic magic is said to have had the desired result. 'When morning dawned,' the chronicle states, 'a great cloud poured rain on the earth. Those who suffered from disease, being well, held a festival.'[1] The rite was performed again in the reign of Sena II. He had the Ratana Sutta engraved on gold plates. The image of Ānanda was taken round the city in procession while monks chanted the paritta and sprinkled water to charm people against illness. He himself was consecrated with it at the Mahāthūpa. The procedure was written down for annual performance.[2] Kassapa V had the rite performed to ward off the plague and to ensure a good harvest.[3]

With the influence of Tantric Buddhism, the use of dhāraṇīs, Tantric incantations, was introduced to Ceylon. Invocations addressed to Vairocana, Śikhi, Gaganabuddha, Ākāśagarbha and Tārā asking favours varying from spiritual benefits like salvation and destruction of sorrow to help in essentially mundane matters like overcoming fatigue and removal of obstruction in the vital organs, are found on copper tablets at the Vijayārāma. They have been dated on palaeographic consideration to the ninth century.[4] Evidently, their use was popular even in the twelfth century.

---

[1] Cv., 37.189-198.

[2] Cv., 51.79-82; see also p. 249 n.2.

[3] Cv., 52.80.

[4] ASC Sixth Progress Report, July to September 1891, Appendix A pp. 12-14.

For a building called the dhāraṇighara was erected by Parakkamabāhu I for the recitation of these incantations.[1]

Apart from these rites which were supposed to be magically potent, festivals and ceremonial which grew round many different cult objects played an important part in the religious life of the Buddhists. The magnificence of a festival would be determined by the importance and the prestige enjoyed by the cult object for which it was performed. One may surmise that the importance of cult objects that a monastery possessed and the scope it offered for cultic activity would largely determine the following that the monastery would have. Monasteries employed special officials to attend to the organization of these festivals.[2] The popularity of these cult objects is reflected in the extensive literature which grew round them which includes works like the Kesadhātuvaṃsa, Daṭhāvaṃsa, Dhātuvaṃsa, Mahābodhivaṃsa, Thūpavaṃsa and their commentaries.

The Cūḷvaṃsa speaks of relic-festivals (dhātupūjā) held by Kassapa IV, Sena III and Mahinda IV.[3] The Anurādhapura slab inscription of Kassapa V and the Kaludiyapokuṇa inscription of Sena III also refer to 'relic festivals' and 'relic-processions'.[4] The Hair-relic was at the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery.[5] Sene I held a festival for it.[6] Another relic, the chinna-

---

[1] Cv., 73.71; see also p.475 ff.

[2] See p.160.

[3] Cv., 52.36; 53.37; 54.54-55.

[4] Ez Vol. I p.46 ll.9-10; Vol. III p.265 l.36.

[5] Cv., 54.40-41.

[6] Cv., 50.71.

paṭadhātuka, is mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa in connection with the reign of Mahinda V.[1] Wijesinghe believed that this was a 'forehead band'. Geiger has suggested that it could have been a strip of cloth from the Buddha's robe.[2]

The festival held in honour of the Tooth relic was perhaps the most popular and elaborate ceremony of its kind. The association with this relic would have been one of the important reasons for the popularity of the Abhayagiri monastery. Fa-Hian[3] who visited Ceylon in the fifth century reports that every year, in the middle of the third month, the relic was taken in procession from the shrine in the centre of the city to the Abhayagiri monastery. If Fa-Hian was following the Chinese calendar, this would fall in about the beginning of April. It was kept there for three months when it was brought back to the city. According to the Cūlavaṃsa[4] Sena II held a festival in honour of this relic. Even at this time the celebrations were held at the Abhayagiri monastery; Sena is said to have gone into the Ratanapāsāda at this monastery during the course of the festival. After the period of the Cola occupations, Vijayabāhu I built a new shrine for the relic and regularly held festivals in its honour.[5]

---

[1] Cv., 55.17.

[2] Geiger: Cv. transl. Vol. I p.187, see also n.3. A stūpa in which the robe of the Buddha had been enshrined is mentioned in the Sihvp. p.7.

[3] Beal, op.cit., p.48.

[4] Cv., 51.22.

[5] Cv., 60.16.

In the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, the Tooth relic was taken in procession round the city. The Cūlavaṃsa[1] gives a detailed description of this festival. The relic was inserted into a hollowed-out jewel filled with scented paste. The jewel was deposited inside a reliquary of precious stones and this was placed in a casket of gold. This casket, together with the Bowl relic, was placed on a seat inside a wheeled pavilion made of gold. The pavilion of the relic guarded by Lambakaṇṇas and other men of high rank who carried whisks, parasols and swords was accompanied by hundreds of other vehicles bearing dancing girls and musicians. The king himself, attended by his dignitaries, accompanied the relics on an elephant, honouring them all the while. After the relics were brought back to their shrine a festival of lamps was held in their honour for seven days. As evident from the Daḷadāsirita, the procession of the Tooth relic became more elaborate by the fourteenth century. An important development was its association with the paritta. The Daḷadāsirita prescribes that seven or at least five monks should continuously recite the paritta before the relic. And during the procession, the monks held the charmed thread attached to the festal car and chanted the paritta as they followed it.[2]

Fa-Hian makes an interesting statement in his description of the honours paid to the Tooth relic. As a result of the regular performance of these rites, he maintains, the kingdom suffered 'neither from famine,

---

[1] Cv., 74.198-248.

[2] Daḷadāsirita p.51.

calamity nor revolution'.[1] The Cūlavaṃsa, too, speaks of the special powers of the relic. Heavy rain poured forth when the relic was taken in procession. Yet, no obstruction was caused to the procession as the cloud moved along before it.[2] In the reign of Parakkamabāhu II when the country was ravaged by a drought caused by the evil influence of the planets, the Tooth relic was taken in procession round the city. This brought forth abundant rain.[3] The Daḷadāsirita prescribes that the relic should be taken in procession in times of drought.[4] It is thus evident that both the recitation of the paritta and the rituals connected with the Tooth relic were associated with important magical functions of curing illness, exorcism and particularly of making rain.

The reigns of Parakkamabāhu I and Nissaṅka Malla saw a profusion of stūpas, especially at Polonnaruva, the foremost works being the Damiḷathūpa, Rankotvehera and the Kirivehera.[5] This period rivals the stūpa-building phase of the early Anurādhapura period in both the size and the number of stūpas built. The erection of new stūpas or the change of the capital to Polonnaruva did not appreciably diminish the popularity of the stūpas at Anurādhapura. The esteem in which especially the Mahāthūpa was held is reflected in the appearance of literary works like the Thūpavaṃsa and the

[1] Beal, op.cit., p.47.

[2] Cv., 74.239-240.

[3] Cv.87.3-9.

[4] Daḷadāsirita p.53.

[5] ARASC 1909 p.6; 1910-11 pp.28-29; 1911-12 pp. 86-89; UHC Vol. I Pt. II pp. 593-595.

costly festivals that were held in its honour.[1]

A different concept of relics appears in two Sinhalese works, the Pūjāvaliya and the Saddharmālaṅkāra, dated to the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries respectively. They refer to śāsanapratiṣṭhā like the Bo-tree and the dharmadhātu which prevent the establishment of the authority of non-Buddhist rulers over the Island. Further, the Saddharmālaṅkāra mentions a type of stūpa, the dharmacaitya, where scriptural works like the Dhamsangunu (P. Dhammasaṅgaṇī) and the Pratītyasamutpāda were enshrined.[2]

The practice of enshrining fragments of scriptures in stūpas was widely spread over the Buddhist world. Traditions of Buddhist kings depositing canonical and commentarial works in stūpas are found in the accounts of Chinese pilgrims who visited India.[3] Plates bearing excerpts from the Pratītyasamutpāda were found at Kasia.[4] Similar tablets containing the formula ye dharmā etc. inscribed in the so-called pre-Nāgarī script have been found in Central Java.[5] According to Stein, the practice of depositing manuscripts in stūpas is illustrated in the paintings of Tun-huang.[6] These deposits were known as dharmadhātu. Grünwedel has pointed

[1] EZ Vol. II pp.70-83; Vol. IV pp. 253-260; see also p.346.

[2] Pjv., p.49; Saddharmālaṅkāra (Bentoṭa Saddhātissa), 1934, p.388; Saddharmaratnakaraya (Kosgoḍa Ñānavimala) 1931, p.298.

[3] See e.g. I-tsing p.150; Beal, op.cit., p.194.

[4] ARASI 1910-1911 p.74.

[5] F.D.K.Bosch, Selected studies in Indonesian archaeology, Hague, 1961 p.171-197.

[6] JRAS 1931 pp. 863-865.

out that they were also known as pratiṣṭhā.[1]

There is strong reason to believe that the practice of honouring the dharmadhātu was known for a long time before the thirteenth century. It is evident from the Cūlavaṃsa and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya that the dharmadhātu containing the writings of the Vaitulya nikāya brought by a merchant from India in the reign of Silākāla (530 A.D.) was housed by the king in a shrine close to the palace. He instituted the practice of taking it each year to the Jetavana monastery where a festival was held in its honour.[2]

By the reign of Kassapa V, this rite had been adapted to suit the requirements of the Therevāda.[3] The Dhammasaṅgaṇī was inscribed on gold plates adorned with jewels and was placed in a shrine in the centre of the city. The king appointed his own son to guard it. This shrine finds mention in a tenth-century inscription of a person who describes himself as the guardian of relics at the shrine of Dhamsanguṇu.[4] Every year the king carried it, riding his elephant at the head of his army through streets decorated with great pomp, to the 'relic shrine' of a monastery which may be identified with the Mariccavaṭṭivihāra.[5] Here, a great festival was held in its honour.

---

[1] Grünwedel, Mythologie... p.110.

[2] Cv., 41.37-40; Niks., pp. 19-20; see also pp.479 ff.

[3] Cv., 52.48-56; EZ Vol. I pp. 46-47 ll.10-11.

[4] EZ Vol. III p.133.

[5] This occurs soon after mention of the Mariccavaṭṭivihāra. The monastery in question is described as one built by the king. The Mariccavaṭṭivihāra is the only one which fits the description.

It is clear from this that the idea of dhammadhātu found acceptance among the Theravādins of the 'orthodox' school. However, evidence for the prevalence of the practice of enshrining dhammadhātu in stūpas has been found so far only at monasteries which came within the Abhayagiri nikāya. According to a tradition preserved in the Saddharmaratnākaraya, a certain king Kassapa enshrined dhammadhātu in the Abhayagiri stūpa which he rebuilt, raising it to a height of 140 cubits.[1] The only Kassapa who is known from other sources to have repaired this stūpa is the fourth king of that name. A number of copper plaques bearing inscriptions in the Sinhalese script of the eighth or the ninth century were found at the Indikaṭusāya at Mihintale. They contain excerpts from Sanskrit Buddhist works like the Prajñāpāramitā and the Kāśyapaparivṛtta.[2] Evidently, the worship of the dhammadhātu was introduced to Ceylon and practised by the Mahāyānists. The idea was borrowed by the Theravādins to develop a ritual to suit their particular requirements.

The worship of the Bo-tree associated with the Enlightenment of the Buddha was an essential part of Buddhist ceremonial. The Mahābodhivaṃsa, an ornate poem of a certain thera Upatissa which testifies to the popularity of this cult, has been dated to the tenth century. Gurulugomi who is placed in the twelfth century by most scholars wrote a Sinhalese commentary on this work called the Dharmapradīpikā. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, it was

---

[1] Saddarmaratnākaraya, p.333; Pjv. p.103.

[2] ARASC 1911-12 pp. 44-46; EZ Vol. III pp.199-212; Vol. IV pp. 238-242.

customary to hold a festival in honour of the Bo-tree at the Mahāvihāra in the twelfth year of each reign.[1] The festival held by Sena II is mentioned in the chronicle.[2] The Mihintale Tablets allocate two kalanḍ of gold towards the cost of festivals for the two Bo-trees at the monastery - the Somnas Mahabo and the Ruvanasun Mahabo.[3]

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the wide popularity of image worship. Apart from images of the Buddha, statues of other important personages like Mahinda and of bodhisattvas and their śaktis were used as cult objects. The colossal image of the Buddha has already come into vogue by the beginning of the period under consideration. The image at Māligāvela which measures 34 ft. in height has been dated to the early seventh century.[4] The thirty-eight foot colossus at Aukana dates probably from the eighth or the ninth century.[5] Images of such large proportions found at sites in Sässeruva, Tantrimalai, Ḷahära, Ataragallāva and Buduruvegala have been dated to the late Anurādhapura period; no specific evidence is available to enable a more precise dating. As evident from the images at Gal Vihāra and the three main paṭimāgharas of Polonnaruva - the Thūpārāma, the Tivaṅkapaṭimāghāra and the Laṅkātilaka - the colossal image retained its popularity in the Polonnaruva period. The Tivaṅkapaṭimāghāra is of special interest owing to its unusual image which is in the

[1] Cv., 38.57.

[2] Cv., 51.78.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp.94-95 ll.B8,12.

[4] ARASC 1954 p.27.

[5] ARASC 1934 pp.21-22.

tribhaṅga, the 'triple-bent' pose.

The colossal image of this period is obviously a representation of the 'super-human' aspect of the Buddha's personality. This is in accord with the ideas that underlie the treatment of the Buddha in literary works like the Butsaraṇa. In these works he is presented as a powerful and heroic figure who overcomes and subdues both human and super-human foes. Such a concept would have suited, for one, the demands of a period of intense rivalry between the Buddhist and Hindu faiths.

Early image houses were built of materials easily susceptible to decay and hence only their foundations remain. A later type, built of brick, is found at the Jetavanārāma.[1] It is surmounted by a vaulted roof from which it receives the name gedige. This type of image house followed a ground-plan which incorporated a circumambulatory path (pradakṣiṇāpatha) to meet, perhaps, a new need of Buddhist ceremonial. It is a development of this type that is represented by Polonnaruva by the three image houses mentioned above. The Laṅkātilaka,[2] built by Parakkamabāhu I, is the tallest and perhaps the most impressive of these buildings. It measures 124 ft. by 66 ft.6 ins. at its full length and the greatest breadth. The preserved portions of its walls rise to a height of 55 ft. and its doorposts measure 40 ft. in height. The interiors of the image houses are arranged like the South Indian Hindu temples in the maṇḍapa-antarāla-garbhagṛha order; but

---

[1] See pp.34-35.

[2] ARASC 1910-1911 pp.30-38.

it is not clear whether this similarity reflects similarities in ritual.

As in the case of relics, elaborate festivals were held in honour of images. The author of the Cūlavaṃsa states that the annual festival of the image of Mahinda was held up to his own day in the manner specified by Sirimeghavaṇṇa in the fourth century. Then he goes on to give in great detail what appears to be an eye-witness' account of the festival. It began on the eighth day of the month of Pubbakattika (October-November) when the gold image of Mahinda was brought to the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale. The following day, it was taken in a procession led by the king to the Sotthiyākara monastery near the eastern gate of the city. On the twelfth day, it was taken to the Mahāvihāra where a festival was held in its honour for three months. Then it was taken to be housed in a shrine close to the palace. Another ceremony was held in its honour on the last day of the season of Retreat.[1] Ceremonies connected with images of Mahinda were held also by Dhātusena and Aggabodhi I on the bund of the Mahinda tank.[2]

The concentration of many important cult objects at the capital would have attracted a large number of pilgrims from the provinces. Pilgrimages to worship at the important shrines scattered over the Island became a common practice. After his capture of Polonnaruva, Vijayabāhu I left on a pilgrimage lasting three months.[3]

---

[1] Cv., 37.66-90.

[2] Cv., 38.58; 42.29-30.

[3] Cv., 59.3.

The Sumanakūṭa, where, according to popular tradition, the 'foot-print-relics' (padalasdā)[1] of the four buddhas of the present kalpa were preserved became a popular centre of pilgrimage during this period. Evidently, this shrine was known and revered even at the time when the Mahāvaṃsa was written. The Cūlavaṃsa mentions routes which led to this place from Rājaraṭṭha through Kadaligāmā and from the province of Hūva. The king built and endowed rest houses for pilgrims who came along these routes.[2] It is possible that there was another route from the province of Māyā through Gilimaleya.[3] Confirmation of the evidence in the Cūlavaṃsa is found in an inscription from Ambagamuva which records the erection of rest-houses at intervals of five gavu on the way from Rājaraṭṭha and the grant of lands for their maintenance and the provision of necessities for two monks.[4] Later on, Nissaṅka Malla went with his whole entourage to pay homage to the shrine; he restored the property of the shrine which had been confiscated by his predecessors.[5] He also visited shrines at Anurādhapura, Velgama, Mādirigiri, Dambulla, Kālaṇiya, Devundara and Mahāgāma.[6] The popularity enjoyed by the Sumanakūṭa is reflected in an ornate Pali poem on the shrine, the Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā, which has been assigned to the Polonnaruva period by some scholars.

---

[1] EZ., Vol. II p.213 l.26.

[2] Cv., 60.64-66.

[3] Identified by Geiger as the village of same name in the Kuruviṭi Korale in the Ratnapura District. Cv., trsl. Pt. I p.221 n.2. The discovery at Gilimale of a duplicate of the Ambagamuva inscription (see fn.4) seems to confirm this suggestion. CJSG Vol. II p.185.

[4] EZ., Vol. II pp.202-218.

[5] Cv., 80.24; CJSG Vol. II No. 378.

[6] EZ., Vol. II p.111 ll.B.10; p.173 ll.29-31.

The growth of the popularity and the importance of ritual in Buddhism is reflected in a statement in a ninth century inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery. According to this record, offerings (satra) were to be performed without fail even if it involved the disruption of the eccleciastical acts (saṅghakārya) of the Order; those responsible for disruption of offerings were to be expelled from the monastery.[1] Monasteries seem to have employed special officials to look after the performance of these rites.[2]

We have already mentioned that certain days of the year were set apart for annual religious festivals. Apart from those mentioned above, the full moon day of the month of Vesākha, traditionally connected with the main events in the life of the Buddha, was considered particularly suitable for religious activity. Sena II celebrated this festival with the poor people, treated them to food and clothing.[3] Parakkamabāhu I celebrated it annually.[4] The uposatha days of the month were traditionally set apart for alms-giving, observance of higher precepts and ritual activity. The second and third kings who took the name Sena gave alms to the poor on uposatha days.[5] Vijayabāhu I and Parakkamabāhu I observed the precepts of higher discipline on the days of the uposatha.[6] The Mihintale Tablets

[1] satravighātam kurvatāpi na vastavyam saṅghakāryavighātepi satravighāto na kartavyah. EZ Vol. I p.5 11.18-19.

[2] See the interpretation of olkāmi in pp.161-162.

[3] Cv., 51.84.

[4] Pjv. p.106.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Cv., 60.21; 73.40.

mention festivals held on uposatha days.[1] Such ceremonies provided occasions which brought the community together. The monastery derived an income from the stalls which were set up for trade on these days.[2] Presumably, ceremonies and festivals were fixed for astrologically auspicious hours. The festival held by Vijayanāvan at the Mahāthūpa was fixed for the asterism of Visā.[3] An astrologer was in the pay of the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale.[4]

The rituals concerning cult objects, especially the images, seem to have been based on the idea that they should be treated like living persons. As such they were bathed, dressed and served with food. Hiuen-tsang records that the Tooth relic was bathed thrice a day.[5] The Daḷadāsirita, too, refers to the preparation of unguents to be used in the bathing of the Tooth relic.[6] A more detailed description is found in an account in the Saddharmaratnākaraya of the rites performed at Dhānyakaṭaka by a Sinhalese monk.[7] The stone image was bathed daily. The marble image was covered with a layer of scented paste two inches in thickness. Sevvanniya[8] flowers were fixed on the paste so that the image looked like a figure

[1] EZ Vol. I p.93 ll.A44-45.

[2] See p.103.

[3] EZ Vol. IV p.256 l.1.

[4] See EZ Vol. I p.96 l.B32.

[5] Beal, op.cit., p.443.

[6] Daḷadāsirita p.51.

[7] Saddharmaratnākaraya pp.500-501.

[8] Rosa Centifolia, Rosa Damascena. ŚSŚ p.1084.

made of flowers. The following day itwas bathed firstly in perfumed water, secondly in sesame oil and thirdly in milk. Then it was rubbed with unguents and finally bathed in clear water.

The Velaikkāra inscription mentions an annual ceremony of applying collyrium on the eyes of a Buddha image.[1] Images were sometimes adorned in extravagant manner. Dhātusena is said to have presented the stone image at the Abhayagiri monastery with a robe made of gold, a wig made of dark blue gems and net of gold for the feet.[2] Kassapa IV presented ornaments for the images (paṭimābharaṇa) of the shrine he built.[3] Devā, the queen of Kassapa V, offered a crest jewel (cūḷāmaṇi), a robe, a net to cover the feet and a parasol to the Buddha image at the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery.[4] Arrangements made for the provision of food are evident from a tenth century inscription from Eppāvala which records the deposit of four kaḷand of gold to pay for curd, honey and two pat of rice to be offered daily to the Bo-tree and the Buddha image at the site.[5]

Similarly, the popularity of the practice of honouring cult objects with lamps, flowers and incense necessitated arrangements at monasteries for the regular provision of these items. A number of inscriptions from this period record endowments made for the supply of oil and wicks for lamps

---

[1] EI., Vol. XVIII p.338.

[2] Cv.38.62-63.

[3] Cv.52.26.

[4] Cv. 52.65.

[5] EZ Vol. III pp.184-194.

at various shrines.[1] The Cetiyagiri monastery employed two florists to supply white flowers and one to supply a hundred and twenty blue lotuses each month to the relic shrine; there was another florist attached to the shrine of the stone image.[2] Women who made garlands were employed at the Mahāthūpa, in the reign of Kalyāṇavatī.[3] The dummalassamun employed at the relic shrine and the image house of the Cetiyagiri monastery probably performed the task of fumigating the shrines by burning incense.[4] The 'four kinds of perfume', incense of kaluvāl and camphor were used for this purpose. Offerings of perfume was such an important item in ritual that the Mahāthūpa had perfumers (osandavaṭuvan) in its employ.[5]

A ceremony of the 'consecration' (abhiseka) of a Buddha image is mentioned in the account of the reign of Kassapa I in the Cūlavaṃsa. It also alludes to a similar ceremony having been held in the reign of Dhātusena.[6] The Mihintale Tablets speak of the 'consecration' of the Buddha (budbisev) in the relic house and the shrine of the image. It appears that both oil and water were used in this ritual.[7] Though it is not possible to exactly determine the significance of this rite it is possible to suggest that it was connected with the idea found in Mahāyāna

---

[1] See e.g. EZ Vol. I p.96 l.B35; Vol. II p.18 ll.C19-21. ARASC 1953 p.27 No.20.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B35-40.

[3] EZ Vol. IV p.257 l.17, p.260 n.6.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B34-38.

[5] See fn.3.

[6] Cv., 38.67; 39.6-7.

[7] EZ Vol. I p.96 ll.B42-43.

works like the Avataṃsaka Sūtra that the tenth or the highest stage of spiritual progress of a bodhisattva was attained after a 'consecration' (abhiṣeka).[1] It seems also indicative of the practice of developing these rituals on the basis of rites connected with royalty.

The monastery was not merely the venue for the performance of rituals. It remained, as it had always been, a place where the community could congregate and listen to discourses and take part in religious discussions. In the fourth century, Fa-Hian noted that public sermons were regularly held within the city of Anurādhapura on the eighth, fourteenth and the fifteenth days of the month.[2] Vijayabāhu I is said to have encouraged preachers with presents.[3] Parakkamabāhu I and Nissaṅka Malla built halls for sermons.[4] Sometimes laymen delivered sermons. Kassapa V was a well known preacher.[5] The Mihintale monastery engaged lay preachers (bana vajārana damin) who were given land allotments for their maintenance.[6] We may surmise that didactic and edificatory stories from the life of the Buddha were popular subjects for such sermons. Parakkamabāhu I appointed a preacher to relate stories and built a special shrine for the purpose.[7] The popularity of

---

[1] Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Fasc. A-Aca, 1961, pp.125-130.

[2] Beal, op.cit., p.47.

[3] Cv., 60.20.

[4] Cv. 73.72, 81; EZ Vol. II pp.165-178.

[5] See p. 485

[6] EZ Vol. I p.96 l.B39.

[7] Cv. 73.72.

these Jātaka tales is evident from the paintings in the shrines of this period.[1] Sometimes, sermons on the higher metaphysical doctrines were also held as in the reigns of Sena II, Kassapa V and Mahinda IV.[2]

The enjoyment of musical entertainments was not viewed with particular favour in early Buddhism . Certainly, the monks were bound by their rules of discipline to abstain from such indulgences. Hence it is rather significant that music seems to have played an important role in most of the rites andceremonies of thisperiod. The use of musicmade the rites more attractive. Presumably, drama, dance and music, like literature, were expected to 'rouse the serene joy (pasāda) and emotion (saṃvega) of the faithful'. The use of music was not an innovation made during the period under discussion. The festivals held by Bhātikābhaya and Mahādāṭhika Mahānāga in the first century A.D. at the Mahāthūpa and the Cetiyapabbata respectively were attended by dance-drama (naṭanacca), song and instrumental music.[3] Songs and dances in honour of the Mahāthūpa were a part of the festivities held by Mahinda IV.[4] Vijayabāhu I had dances performed in honour of the Buddha.[5] The use of musical entertainments in relic processions finds mention in a tenth century inscription of Ādipāda Mahinda

---

[1] The Vessantara, Asaṅka, Sasa, Tuṇḍila, Vidhura, Guttila, Culla Paduma, Maṭribala, Mugapakkha, Sama, Maha Sudassana and Ummagga Jātakas have been identified among the paintings on the walls of Tivaṅka image houses. ARASC 1909 p.32.

[2] Cv., 51.79; 52.49; 54.36.

[3] Mv., 34.59, 60, 77.

[4] Cv., 54,37-38.

[5] Cv., 60.18.

from Mayilagastoṭa.[1] In the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, music was employed in ritual on an elaborate scale. Dancers and musicians, both male and female, playing lutes, flutes and drums followed the Tooth relic when it was taken in procession, honouring it with song, dance and music.[2]

The regular use of musical entertainment in Buddhist ritual led, at least by the time of Kalyāṇavatī, to the engagement of musicians in the service of the monastery. The Ruvanvälisäya inscription of this reign refers to dancers, singers and musicians adept at playing drums, conches and the 'five instruments'.[3] in a list of the employees of the shrine.[4] According to the Daladāsirita, a large orchestra in which thirty six instruments are listed was employed at the shrine of the Tooth relic.[5]

Some evidence in the Mihintale Tablets seem to suggest that the practice of employing musicians in the regular service of monasteries dates back to a much earlier period. This record refers to a group of eleven employees called äli led by another called älinävak.[6] Wickremasinghe took the term äli as derived from ālikkam and translated it as 'painters'. But this seems improbable as the term sittarak, too, occurs in the list of employees. There is no doubt that sittarak connotes 'painter'. The sittarak received a land allotment of two kiri; the älinävak received two payas of land and a daily allowance of one admanā and one pat of rice while his assistants received

---

[1] EZ Vol. II pp.60-61 ll.13-21.

[2] Cv., 74.216-218.

[3] Two drums (davul, tammäṭṭan) and three wind instruments (horanä, nāgasinnam and sak) are listed in the Sinhalese works. See SSS p.969. Sorata takes pamcayan as one instrument.

[4] EZ Vol. IV p.256 ll.15-16.

(cont.)

a similar allotment of land with a vasag each.[1] In contemporaneous inscriptions from South India, the temple musicians occur in groups of eleven. A record of Rājarāja Cola mentions six groups of musicians. Each consisted of eleven members and was led by another.[2] Āli may be connected with the Tamil word ālikkal which was a dance and ālippettu, the term by which the dance of Krsna was known. Āli also connotes a mask worn by dancers at temple festivals. It may be suggested that the āli were a group of musicians or dancers employed at the monastery. If our interpretation is right, the practice of employing musicians at monasteries can be dated back to at least the tenth century.

Like music, painting was expected to play an edificatory role in depicting scenes fromthe life and the previous existences of the Buddha. Paintings of this type decorate the inner walls of the Tivaṅka image house at Polonnaruva.[3] At Abhayagiri a part of the income of the monastery was set apart to meet the cost of religious paintings.[4] A painter was in the employ of the Cetiyagiri monastery.[5] Thus the arts were actively patronized

---

(cont.)

[5] Daḷadāsirita pp.49, 52.

[6] EZ., Vol. I p.95 ll.B13-14.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.95 ll.B13-14. For explanations of the terms kiri, paya, pata, admaṇa and vasag, see pp. 84, 91, 213-15.

[2] Tanjore inscription No. 66 SII Vol. II pp.259-303.

[3] See p.342 fn. 1.

[4] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.52-54.

[5] See p. 343.

by the monastery which became an employer of artists. However, in the thirteenth century, the Dambadeni Katikāvata speaks of literary and dramatic arts in a tone of disapproval. Monks were directed to refrain from learning or teaching such 'despised branches of knowledge'.[1] The statement is significant not only for its derogatory tone but also for what it reveals. For the cultivation of their talents in the literary and dramatic arts by Buddhist monks seems to have become, by this time, a phenomenon which attracted the attention of the reformers.

Some of the Buddhist rites and ceremonial described above, especially those relating to the worship of images, appear to be strikingly similar to the Hindu ritual of the period. However, this does not necessarily mean that the Buddhist ritual was derived from Hinduism. The Bodhicaryāvatāra a Buddhist Sanskrit work datable to about the eighth century, describes rites like the bathing of images, adorning them with robes and ornaments and the performance of musical entertainments in honour of the Buddha and the bodhisattvas.[2] The influence, therefore, could have come from Mahāyāna Buddhism. It is also significant that some of these practices go back to a very early period in Ceylon. Yet, it is quite possible that certain of these rites were borrowed from Hinduism and that the prominence that ritual gained in Buddhist religious life in Ceylon was a reaction to if not the result of the influence of Hindu ritual.

The growth of elaborate ceremonial in Buddhism necessitated consider-

---

[1] kāvya nāṭakādī garhita vidyā tamā nūgata yutu. anunut nūgānviya yutu. Katikavat Sangara p.15.

[2] Bodhicaryāvatāra (Medhānanda), 1959, ch. 2 pp.10-11 vv.10-14.

able expenditure on the part of the monastery and its patrons. Shrines were sometimes individually endowed to meet the cost of such rites. Evidently, the main festivals were held by the kings. Festivals were held on a grand scale in the reign of Nissaṅka Malla. During a festival held at the Mahāthūpa, he is said to have scattered pearls on the terrace and offered flowers of gold and silver, banners of silk and the seven kinds of gems. He claims that it cost him four million pieces of gold (masuran) and that he spent seven hundred thousand on another festival at Dambulla.[1] The example of kings was sometimes followed by the gentry. The lavish offerings made to the Mahāthūpa by an official in the reign of Kalyāṇavati are recorded in an inscription at the site.[2]

Festivals were occasions which brought the community together. They gave the patrons an opportunity to gain prestige and popularity. For the king and the gentry, it was an opportunity to demonstrate and legitimize their political and social status. It is significant that many of the important cult objects including the Tooth relic, the Dhammadhātu brought from India in the reign of Silākāla, the gold tablets bearing the Dhammasaṅgaṇi and the gold image of Mahinda were housed in shrines by the royal palace. Further, the king is often mentioned as participating and taking the leading part in these festivals. The patronage of and the participation in such festivals was an effective means of legitimizing the position of the king and as such they would have been of great political value

[1] EZ Vol. II p.80 ll.25-26; Vol. I p.132 ll.24-25. These figures are not very reliable. Nissaṅka Malla was given to exaggeration. In this case, he contradicts himself. Cf figures given in EZ Vol. II p.112 l.B11.

[2] EZ Vol. IV pp. 253-260.

- particularly to foreigners on the Sinhalese throne like Nissaṅka Malla.

Sena II, it was mentioned earlier, is said to have celebrated the Vesākha festival in the company of the poor. By the beginning of the Polonnaruva period, the Buddhist ceremony seems to have ceased to perform this function of bringing together the gentry and the commoners. An inscription from the reign of Vijayabāhu I refers to the practice of assigning separate places at shrines to worshippers of different social status. According to this record, the king built, on the peak of the Sumanakūṭa, a terrace enclosed by a wall which had gates fitted with locks and keys, This was meant for people of 'good birth' who came to honour the footprint of the Buddha. A second terrace was built on a lower level for men of 'inferior birth' (adhama jātin).[1] Perhaps, such arrangements are a reflection on a period when the social stratification was becoming rigid.[2] According to the Daḷadāsirita, a similar arrangement was known at the shrine of the Tooth relic; this was based on official status. The sanctum had two ante-chambers attached to it. None but the attendants of the relic shrine was allowed inside the sanctum. The saṅgha, royalty, officials permitted to enter the 'crown room' and the officials of the relic shrine were allowed to enter the first ante-chamber. Another group which enjoyed this honour were 'those versed in the scriptures' (dharmadhara). Courtiers honoured the relic from the second. All others had to perform their rites from outside the third doorway.[3] It seems

[1] EZ Vol. II p.214 ll.35-37.

[2] It is the same tendencies which are reflected in the disputes of this period over caste privileges. See EZ Vol. III pp.303-312.

[3] Daḷadāsirita pp.49-50.

significant that social distinctions of birth and office were recognised and given expression in the organization of Buddhist ritual.

The study of the development of ritual and ceremonial in Sinhalese Buddhism reveals the absorption of elements from popular cults and Brahmanism, from the Mahāyāna and perhaps from Hinduism. In the course of this development it acquired a cultic system to cater to some fundamental religio-magical needs of the society like 'rain-making' and warding off illness and bad harvests. Moreover, it developed, under the stimulant influence of these religions and cults, a body of ritual and ceremonial enlivened by dance and music to serve the needs of mass religiosity. Buddhism, as it was known and practised in Ceylon during the period under review, had become in fact, a composite religion developed and modified to suit the needs of the greater majority of the community and far different from its original form.

Chapter 7.

RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN CENTRES OF BUDDHISM

The geographical situation of Ceylon in the Indian Ocean which commands the entrance to the Bay of Bengal from the west helped its development as an important entrepot in the extensive sea-borne trade which linked Europe in the west with the Chinese empire in the east. In the sixth century, Cosmas Indicopleustes recorded that merchantmen from Ethiopia and Persia called at this emporium described as 'the greatest in those parts' to purchase its products and other merchandise brought from lands as far as China in the east and Male, Kaliana, Sindh, and Adule in the west. He also noted that ships from Ceylon were sent to these lands to trade in cloth, spices, metalware, precious stones and elephants.[1] Even if the volume of trade with the west had diminished by the beginning of the period under consideration, there is reason to believe that Ceylon continued to play an important role in the trade of the Bay of Bengal. An eleventh century record of the Javanese king Airlanga mentions the Sinhalese among the communities of foreign merchants who lived at the Javanese ports.[2] The trade between Burma and Ceylon was thriving in the twelfth century. In fact, a dispute about these trade rights was one of the causes which led to the hostilities between the two countries in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.[3] A variety of fine cloth

---

[1] The Christian Topography (ed. E. O. Winstedt) p.322.

[2] G. Coedès: Les états hindouisés... p.268.

[3] Cv., 76.17-21.

imported from Ceylon finds mention in the Rājataraṅgaṇī.[1] Presumably, it was a similar fabric brought from Ceylon which was referred to as wdihan siṅhal in the Old Javanese inscriptions from the end of the ninth century.[2] A fabric called 'Laṅkā cloth' is mentioned also in the Siamese annals.[3]

The trading vessels which plied the Bay of Bengal sometimes took on board monks and lay Buddhists bound for places of pilgrimage and centres of Buddhist learning. The Sīhalavatthupakaraṇa and the Sahassavatthupakaraṇa relate many stories about monks who sailed in merchantmen to ports of Bengal and the Coromandel coast; according to one of these stories, a group of monks went to Cīnaloka.[4] The more detailed accounts of the travels of Fa-Hian and Vajrabodhi clearly illustrate how the extensive commercial intercourse which connected the lands round the Bay of Bengal helped movements of monks. Fa-Hian left Tāmralipti in a large merchantman and reached Ceylon in fourteen days. On his return, he boarded another merchantman which carried two hundred men and reached Ye-po-ti.[5] after sailing eastwards for ninety days. From there he took yet another trading vessel to China.[6] According to the biography of Vajrabodhi, compiled by Tuen-tchao in the ninth century, he set forth from South India on his way to China and reached

---

[1] Rājt. (ed. R. S. Pandit), p.35.

[2] Art. As. Vol. XXIV p.245.

[3] C. Notton, Histoire du Dhammarāja et notre Seigneur, Annals du Siam, Vol. I p.75.

[4] Sihvp., pp. 39, 42, 44, 136. Shsvp., pp. 36, 64, 145.

[5] Beal has suggested identification with Java or Sumatra. Chinese Accounts of India p.52.

[6] Beal op.cit., pp. 51-54.

Ceylon after sailing for twenty-four hours. Here, he saw thirty-five Persian trading vessels. Vajrabodhi sailed from Ceylon in the company of the Persian merchants and came to the kingdom of Fo-chi[1] after spending one month at sea. From there, he proceeded to China and arrived at the capital in 720 A.D.[2] These accounts demonstrate that the position Ceylon occupied as a centre of the trade in the Indian Ocean provided the saṅgha with ample opportunities to maintain regular contact with their brethren in the centres of Buddhism in India and South-East Asia.

In the period of Pāla rule, the eastern regions of India witnessed the efflorescence of Buddhist culture centering on the monasteries of Nālandā, Vikramaśīla and Somapurī which emerged as the leading schools of Buddhist scholarship. These monasteries produced the most prominent exponents of the Tantric teachings of this period. At the same time, they provided a meeting place for scholars from different parts of the Buddhist world representing varied Buddhist traditions. The influence of these schools spread to Nepal and thence to Tibet where Tāntrism found a congenial home. Scholars from Eastern India like Śāntarakṣita, Padmasambhava and Atīśa and Tibetan teachers and translators who had studied in India contributed to the expansion of these influences. In South-East Asia, though no such detailed information is available, the appearance of the so-called 'pre-Nāgarī' script in inscriptions which speak of the presence of Mahāyanist and Tāntric practices points to the origin of these influences in Eastern India. In rare instances,

[1] = Bhoja (Kāmboja?) I-tsing refers to a certain Fo-shi-pu-lo which was an island in the "Southern Sea". I-tsing p.10.

[2] JRASCB Vol. XXIV pp. 87-89.

more specific evidence is available. The Kēlurak inscription, dated A.D. 782, records the erection of an image of Mañjuśrī by a certain Kumāraghoṣa, a teacher from Gauḍadvīpa (Bengal).[1] It is reasonable to expect that these currents of influence which swept over Tibet in the north-west and the Javanese kingdom in the south-east at least caused ripples in Ceylon, too.

The shrine of Buddha Gayā, sacred to all Buddhists as the site of the Enlightenment of the Buddha, attracted pilgrims from Ceylon from the earliest times.[2] The Chinese source Hing-tchoan of Yang Hiuen ts'e mentions that a special monastery was built at Buddha Gayā by a king of Ceylon[3] for the use of monks from his country.[4] Some of the monks have left records of their visits and the meritorious works they undertook at the site. Apart from Mahānāma, a monk of the sixth century, who has left two inscriptions recording the donation of a dwelling and a Buddha image to the Buddha Gayā monastery, Prakhyātakīrtti, another Sinhalese monk, claims in a donative inscription datable to the sixth or the seventh century, to have belonged to the royal family of Ceylon.[5]

---

[1] F. D. K. Bosch, 'De Inscriptie van Keloerak', Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal=, Land= en Volkenkunde, 68, 1928 pp. 18-20 vv. 6-9.

[2] The Sihvp. contains several stories about monks going on pilgrimage to Buddha Gaya. One of the inscriptions dated to the second century B.C. records a donation made by a pilgrim from Tambapaṇṇi. ARASI 1908-9 p.156.

[3] Chi-mi-kia-po-mo identified as Sirimeghavaṇṇa (301-328 A.D.)

[4] JRASCB Vol. XXIV p.75.

[5] CII Vol. III pp. 274-278; Indian Antiquary Vol. XV pp. 356-359; ARASI 1908-9 pp. 156-7.

Tāranātha records a tradition about the Sinhalese monks who lived at Buddha Gayā in the reign of Dharmapāla (c. 770-810 A.D.):

> 'Damals erklärten in Otantapurī die Saindhava-Çrāvakas, die Mönche hätten durch Zweifel sich geirrt und wären schelcht geworden, und so behaupteten auch diese Bhikṣus, als zu einer Zeit der Ācārya in Nālandā weilte, Buddhajñāna sei ohne Disciplin, ungeeignet zum Abt des Saṅgha, leisteten Widerstand, und schimpften auf die Tantras. In vajrāsana zerstörten die vielen Saindhava und Siṅghala-Bhikṣus das in Silber gegossene Bild des Heruka und machten sich einen Gewin daraus. Und der König liess desshalb viele von den Siṅghala-Bhikṣus tödten. Da er sich nun daran machte, auch die übrigen Saindhavas zu vertilgen, schütze der Ācārya sie in seinem grossen Erbarmen vor der Austilgung durch den König.'[1]

In another of his works Tāranātha adds more information on the event:

> 'Zu der Zeit gaben einige Saindhava's, welche Çrāvaka's aus Siṁhala u.s.w. waren, in einem Vadschrāsana-Tempel das grosse aus Silber verfertigte Bildniss Heruka's und viele Mantra-Bücher für ein Werk Māra's aus, die Bücher benutzten sie als Heizmaterial und das Bildniss zerstückelten sie und machten sich einen Gewinn daraus. Ferner überredten sie viele aus Bhangala nach Vikramaçīla zur Verehrung Wandernde sich zu ihnen zu bekehren, indem sie behaupteten, dass die Mahājāna-Lehre ein Leben voll Verkehrtheit sei und dass sie die Lehrer des wahrhaften Gesetzes aufgeben sollten.'[2]

Apart from the presence of the Sinhalese monks at Buddha Gayā, some interesting facts emerge from these passages: the close relationships that the Sinhalese monks maintained with the Saindhavas, their common opposition to the Tantric practices and their attempts to convert the followers of the Mahāyāna to their own teachings.

Very little is known about the Saindhavas. In the first passage,

---

[1] A. Grünwedel, Tāranātha's Edelsteinmine, das Buch von den verittlern der Sieben Inspirationen p.93. The English translation by B. Datta is not very accurate.

[2] A. Schiefner, Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien p.221.

Tāranātha refers to the Saindhavas as a group of monks who lived at the monastery of Odantapurī. In an earlier context, Nāgārjuna is said to have refuted the dialectical polemics of the Saindhavas.[1] Presumably, they were Hīnayānists. Bu-ston, the fourteenth-century Tibetan chronicler, refers to the Saindhava śrāvakas in connection with the reckoning of the Buddhist era. According to him, they devoted some time every evening to these calculations.[2] An inscription from the Bihār-Sharif area dated in the reign of Mahendrapāla of Kanauj (c. 890-917 A.D.) records a donation made to the Saindhavas.[3] Probably, as in the case of the Simhala monks, the term Saindhava was a regional description. Hiuen-tsang noted that there were about ten thousand monks belonging to the Sammitīya school of the Little Vehicle in Sind.[4] Some of the stories in the Sīhalavatthu-pakaraṇa testify to the prevalence of relations between the Buddhist communities on Western India and Ceylon.[5] The traditions recorded by Tāranātha reveal thatmonks from Ceylon, representing probably the Mahāvihāra nikāya, united with the monks from Sind in their opposition to the Mahāyāna and Tāntric practices in the latter part of the eighth century or the early decades of the ninth century.

The shrine of Buddha Gayā continued to attract Ceylonese pilgrims - both monks and laymen - throughout the periodunder review. In an inscription

[1] Grünwedel op.cit. p.17. Here it occurs as Sendhava śrāvaka.

[2] Bu-ston; The history of Buddhism in India and Tibet (E. O. Obermiller) p.107.

[3] H. Sasatri, MASI No. 66, 1942 p.105.

[4] Beal op.cit. p.461.

[5] Sihvp., pp. 57, 59, 63, 64, 67, 70, 74.

datable on palaeographic grounds to the ninth or the tenth century, Udayaśrī, a Sinhalese, records the gift of a Buddha image to the shrine at the site.[1] A tenth century panegyrical record which speaks of the dedication of an image house by a Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince was composed by a Sinhalese scholar, a monk named Śrī Jana.[2] When Vijayabāhu I captured power over Rājaraṭṭha, he sent a mission to offer on his behalf precious stones and pearls to the shrine of the Bodhi tree at Buddha Gayā.[3] The Sinhalese clerical community finds mention again in an inscription from the site dated in the year 51 of the era of Lakṣmaṇa Sena (c. 1157 A.D.).[4] In this record, the execution of an endowment made to the shrine was vested in the charge of the leaders of the Sinhalese saṅgha.

It is evident from the foregoing account and particularly from the twelfth-century inscription cited above that, apart from the occasional pilgrim who came to worship at the shrines of Eastern India, there was a community of Sinhalese monks who were permanent residents at the monastery of Buddha Gayā. Their numbers would have been augmented during times of political turmoil in Ceylon like the period of Coḷa rule. It is unlikely that they were confined to Buddha Gayā. Most probably, some of them would have been attracted to the centres of Buddhist learning which flourished at short distances from this shrine. If some of the Sinhalese monks opposed the teachings of the Mahāyāna and the Tantras as Tāranātha reveals, it is possible that

[1] ARASI 1908-9 p.157.

[2] Rajendralal Mitra, Buddha Gayā pp. 194-197.

[3] Cv., 60.23.

[4] Cunningham, Mahābodhi pp. 78-9.

there were others who were fascinated by these ideas and carried their influence back to Ceylon to stimulate the development of Buddhist thought in the Island. Further, it seems reasonable to expect that, like the Sinhalese monks who visited India, there were monks from the Bihar-Bengal region who went to Ceylon to disseminate their teachings.

In this connection, a single strophe, almost cryptic in its conciseness, which appears in the chapter of the Cūlavaṃsa dealing with the reign of Seṇa I (833-853), seems to be of interest due to its unusual implications:

> Katvā Viraṅkurārāmaṃ vihāre Abhayuttare
> Mahāsaṅghikabhikkhunaṃ Theriyanaṃ ca dapayi.[1]

The translation presents no difficulties: 'He (Sena I) built the Viraṅkurārāma in the Abhayagiri monastery and granted it to the Mahāsaṅghika monks and those of the Theriya school.' Apparently, the author did not attach much significance to this episode. For he dismissed it with a single strophe. Perhaps, he was merely recording a piece of information found in his sources without realizing its true significance. It is also possible that the author considered the matter too controversial for further comment. But it is of extreme importance to the student of the history of Buddhism in Ceylon as it is the only reference found in the chronicles to the presence of the Mahāsaṅghika school in the Island. We learn from this strophe that the Viraṅkurārāma was built at the Abhayagiri monastery for

---

[1] Cv., 50.68.

their use; this may suggest that a considerable number of monks were involved.

Evidently, Geiger had no compunctions about accepting this statement of the Cūlavaṃsa. But Bechert who brought out a posthumous edition of Geiger's writings commented that he was inclined to read Mahiṃsāsakabhikkhūnaṃ for Mahāsaṅghikabhikkhūnaṃ. In support of this emendation, he points out that Fa-Hian found a copy of the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Mahiṃsāsakas in Ceylon.[1] It is significant, however, that the term Mahiṃsāsaka does not occur in any one of the many manuscripts consulted for three different editions of the Cūlavaṃsa; they unanimously agree with the present reading. Hence, an emendation to suit our convenience, without further consideration of other possible explanations, seems rash and unwarranted; and it has to be admitted that the Cūlavaṃsa records in rather forthright though laconic terms that the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Theravādins were given an ārāma at the Abhayagiri monastery. It also implies that Sena I extended his patronage to them.

The author of the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, a fourteenth-century work which purports to be a history of Buddhism in Ceylon, considered the reign of Sena I to be of greater importance than is apparent in the Cūlavaṃsa. He unleashes a rather strong attack on Sena. He calls Sena an insane man untutored in the words of the wise. Like a grasshopper who plunges into fire thinking it is gold, he was credulous enough to readily accept the false

---

[1] CCMP p.208 n.1; Beal, op.cit., p.51.

dharma to the neglect of the true. It was in retribution for his association with the false dharma, the chronicler adds, that the king had to surrender his capital to the Tamils and flee to Polonnaruva to die in disgrace.[1]

This account contrasts sharply with the description of Sena I in the Cūlavaṃsa. The Pali chronicle describes the defeat he faced at the hands of the Pāṇḍya invaders; but it also recounts the many instances of the patronage he extended to the saṅgha. Sena was an ideal ruler endowed with the ten qualities of kingship. He is described as buddhabhūmigatāsayo, an aspirant to Buddhahood who had his thoughts fixed on the Ultimate.[2] The use of the term buddhabhūmi which denotes the highest of the ten stages of progressive spiritual development listed in the Śatasahasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā strongly suggests Mahāyānist associations.[3]

The reason which moved the religious dignitary who wrote the Nikāya-saṅgrahaya to the use of such bitter words seems to have been the patronage that Sena extended to an Indian monk who arrived in Ceylon in his reign. He, the chronicler says, was a heretic of the Vajraparvata nikāya who came

---

[1] Niks. pp. 20-21.

[2] buddhabhūmigatāsayo Cv., 50.65. sāradassano Cv., 50.83; see also Cv., 50.1-3,62. According to its colophon, the Siyabaslakara, an early Sinhalese work based on the Kāvyadarśa of Daṇḍi, was written by a certain king Salamevan Sen at the request of his brother, the minister Amaragiri Kasup. In the Cūlavaṃsa, the only king of this name who had a brother called Kassapa was Sena I. If on this basis Sena I is identified as the author of this work, it would appear that Sena was, contrary to the statements of the author of the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, a very learned man, too. See Siyabaslakara vv. 406-407.

[3] Śsp., 1473.11; 1520.20. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, Vol. II p.411.

in the guise of a Buddhist monk. This heretic settled at the Virāṅkurārāma. He used fifteen kalandaka of gold to bribe Girivasasen, a palace official through whose help he gained the ear of the king. The king was deceived into accepting the Vājiriyavāda preached as a secret doctrine. It was in this reign, he says, that śāstras like the Ratnakūṭa were brought to Ceylon. And the Vājiriyāvāda had persisted ever since as an esoteric doctrine practised in private by the foolish.[1] The last statement alludes to the prevalence of the Vājiriyavāda at the time this work came to be written. Presumably, the chronicler is recording a tradition, known in his time, which traced the origin of these practices to the reign of Sena I.

The difference between the traditions in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya in both content and form point to their independent origin. The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya makes no mention of the Mahāsaṅghikas or their corporate existence with the Theravādins. It presents information not found in the Cūlavaṃsa in mentioning the introduction of the teachings of the Vājiriyavāda and the bringing of the śāstras; it makes specific reference to the arrival in Ceylon of a monk from India.

On the other hand, the tradition in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya confirms the information in the Cūlavaṃsa on certain important points. Both date the incident to the reign of Sena I and mention the Virāṅkurārāma in this connection. Further, both these texts reveal, though not in the same terms, that a school which did not subscribe to the Theravāda teachings gained the

---

[1] Niks. pp. 20-21.

support of the king. The fact that the two chronicles contain two traditions which, though some dissimilar, corroborate each other on main points, suggests that there was a historical basis for these traditions.

However, the information in the two chronicles is too meagre to provide a coherent picture of this incident. Further, the statements, especially in the Cūlavaṃsa, are too grave in their implications to be accepted without corroborative evidence. In this connection, it is interesting that certain statements in an inscription from Anurādhapura provide contemporary evidence which corroborates and supplements the traditions in the chronicles. It has been pointed out that the Vīraṅkurārāma was built, according to the Cūlavaṃsa, within the precincts of the Abhayagiri monastery. This record, erroneously called the Jetavanārāma Sanskrit inscription, was found among the ruins of a parivena to the north of the Kuṭṭampokuna within the grounds of the Abhayagiri monastery.[1] The published portion is only one part of an extensive record. For it begins with a part of a conjoint word. The attempts made so far to recover the other parts have been of no avail.

The published portion has some lacunae in the middle and the bottom of the slab where it has been damaged, but on the whole is well-engraved and renders a fairly satisfactory and reliable reading. It was composed in Sanskrit and is inscribed in the Nāgari script of the 'nail-headed' variety. Some of the letters seem to have developed kuṭila forms. Wickre-

---

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 1-10.

masinghe who edited the inscription remarked on the similarity of the script to that used in the Magadha area in about the middle of the ninth century. A more detailed comparative study seems to bear out these remarks.

It is not possible to trace all the palaeographic forms occurring in this record to any one particular Indian inscription; but the Abhayagiri inscription bears a close resemblance in its script to the Buddha Gayā, Nālandā, and Khalimpur inscriptions of Dharmapāla.[1] Certain peculiar and rare forms found in the Abhayagiri inscriptions like the two varieties of the initial a, the initial i formed of two dots beneath a regular 'nail-head' and the initial e which has a short 'tail' attached to the bottom of its vertical are found in the Khalimpur inscription of the thirty-second regnal year of Dharmapāla. The form of the initial i was continued in the later Pāla records like the Nālandā copper plate of the thirty-ninth year of Devapāla, the Badāl inscription of Nārāyanapāla and the Chittagong copper plates of Khantideva.[2] Another interesting example for comparison is the ma which has a circular loop beneath a 'nail-head'. This is different from the examples in the Buddha Gayā and Khalimpur inscriptions of Dharmapāla but the form in the Nālandā record of this king is almost identical in appearance. The r before a consonant is represented in the Abhayagiri inscription by a second 'nail-head' drawn in such a way that it is in line

---

[1] Nālandā Inscription MASI No. 66, 1942 pl. Xa. Khalimpur Inscription JRAS (Beng.) 1894 pp. 39-62 pl. III. Buddha Gayā Inscription JRAS (Beng.) 1908 p . 101 pl. VI.

[2] Nālandā Copper Plate EI Vol. XVII plate facing p.320. Badāl Inscription EI Vol. II plate facing p.160.

with the rest of the letters. In the inscriptions of Dharmapāla, it is the earlier variety with the second 'nail-head' above the line of the letters that is common; but the Buddha Gayā inscription has a mixture of both these varieties.

On the whole, the Abhayagiri inscription appears older in its palaeographic forms than the inscriptions of the reign of Devapāla. Yet, certain individual letters appear to be more developed than their counterparts in the inscriptions of Dharmapāla and parallels can be found only in the records of Devapāla. The initial u, for instance, has been expressed with two variant forms. One has a regular curve beneath a 'nail-head', which finds parallels in the Buddha Gayā inscription of Dharmapāla. The other has a rather florid neck and a notched curve. It issimilar to the form found in the Khalimpūr inscription but more closely resembles the examples in the Nālandā plates of Devapāla.[1] Similarly, the conjoint ksa is not very different from the form in the Khalimpūr inscription but finds a more exact parallel in the Monghyr plates of the thirty-third year of Devapāla.[1] Three different symbols were used in the Abhayagiri inscription to represent the cerebral na. Two of them are also found in the Khalimpūr plates. But the third, a more developed form, is not found in it. All the three forms appear in the Monghyr copper plates. The la of the Abhayagiri inscription is markedly different from the examples in both the Nālandā and the Buddha Gayā inscriptions of Dharmapāla. It comes closest to the forms found in the records of Devapāla.

---

[1]Monghyr Plates EI Vol. XVIII plate facing p.304.

It is clearly evident from this comparison that the Abhayagiri inscription bears a very close resemblance in its palaeographic forms to the inscriptions in the Bihar-Bengal area of India. Presumably, the scribe who indited this record was either a person from the eastern regions of India or at least one who had deeply imbibed the traditions of this region. Secondly, the script of this record gives the impression that it is later than the Khalimpur record of Dharmapāla but earlier than the inscriptions issued in the latter part of the reign of Devapāla. It may not be too hazardous to assign this record, on these considerations, to the first half of the ninth century. The reign of Sena I falls within this period.

The inscription deals with a variety of subjects including the allowances and emoluments of the monks and the employees, the procedure of administration and the conditions of residence at the monastery. The last six of the legible lines fix the number of monks who were to live at the monastery and regulations pertaining to the filling of vacancies that may occur.

It appears that this portion of the inscription deals with regulations instituted for a hermitage that had been recently founded. The hermitage seems to have been given to a hundred monks comprising twenty five from each of the four principal nikāyas. There was also provision for forty monks engaged in the study of the śāstras; they were to be tutored without affiliation to any one of the nikāyas:

> cātur-mahā-nikāyeṣu pañcaviṁśatiḥ pañcaviṁśatistapasvinaḥ tena śatannaivasikanam. catvariṁśat śāstrābhiyukta tapasvinaḥ. nikāyabhedavinapi gṛhitaniśrayaḥ.....[1]

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.33-34.

These two lines of the inscription are quite clear and the reading is correct.

The term nikāya could be given three possible interpretations. It could be used to denote the divisions of the Canon, the main divisions of the Sutta Piṭaka or schools of religious opinion. When the Canon is classified under nikāyas the number is always five and hence the first meaning is not applicable in this particular case.[1] If the second interpretation is accepted, the passage would mean that each of the four nikāyas were to be studied by separate groups of twenty five monks while forty studied the exegetical treatises thereon. However, the divisions of the Sutta Piṭaka are usually called āgamas in Buddhist Sanskrit works. The Sutta Piṭaka contained five and not four divisions though the fifth, the Khuddaka Nikāya, was not accepted as an authentic collection in the early days. Moreover, it would be strange if arrangements were made for the study of the śāstras and the four divisions of the Sutta Piṭaka without any similar arrangements for the other sections of the Canon. The construction of the relevant sentenee with the term nikāya in the Locative Case also suggests that it was a faction of monks rather than a section of the Sutta Piṭaka that was denoted by the word. The meaning of the word becomes more apparent when some of the regulations are examined. In case of a deficiency in the prescribed number of monks of a particular nikāya, the deficiency was to be by monks from other nikāyas but with the approval of the nikāya concerned.

[1] See Smp., Vol. I pp. 26-28.

In case of an expulsion, however, the deficiency was to be filled with monks from other nikāyas.[1] These regulations and the condition that the forty monks studying the śāstras were to be tutored without affiliation to any one of the nikāyas leave little doubt that it was a fraternity of monks that was denoted by the term nikāya in the Abhayagiri inscription.

According to the Cūlavaṃsa, the Vīraṅkurārāma was given to the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Theriyas. The term Theriya was generally used in the chronicle to denote the monks of the Mahāvihāra. But it could apply to the monks of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana school s as well. In fact, the foreign lists include all the three groups in the Sthaviravādin school.[2] Hence, Theriya or Sthaviravadin were terms which could denote all three or any one of the main schools of Buddhism in Ceylon. If the strophe in question from the Cūlavaṃsa and the passage from the inscription are taken as referring to the same incident, the term 'four nikāyas' may be explained as denoting the Mahāsaṅghikas and the three Buddhist schools of Ceylon. Thus the passage in the inscription would imply that each of the schools was represented at the Vīraṅkurārāma by twenty-five of their number. This explanation fits in with most of the known evidence. But the suggestion that the monks of the Mahāvihāra who always regarded themselves as the orthodox faction consented at this time to live with particularly the Mahāsaṅghikas and that in a hermitage within the precinct s of the Abhayagiri monastery does not seem very likely.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.5 ll.-35-37; see also p.9.

[2] A. Bareau, Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule pp. 25-26.

In this connection, a statement of I-tsing who visited India in the seventh century seems to throw valuable light on the problem: 'Throughout the five divisions of India, as well as the islands of the Southern Sea,' he reports, 'people speak of the four nikāyas... In Magadha, the doctrines of the four nikāyas are generally in practice, yet the Sarvāstivāda nikāya flourishes most ... In the eastern frontier countries, the four nikāyas are found side by side (literally "The eastern frontier countries practise mixedly the four nikāyas.).' I-tsing goes on to enumerate the four nikāyasas the Āryamūlasarvāstivādanikāya, Āryamahāsaṅghikanikāya, Āryasthaviranikāya and the Āryasammitīyanikāya.[1] It is evident from this passage that the term 'four nikāyas' was used to denote the Sarvāstivādins, Mahāsaṅghikas, Sthaviras and the Sammitīyas who seem to have emerged, by the time of I-tsing, as the four leading nikāyas among the Buddhist saṅgha. The words of I-tsing also suggest that there was some form of co-existence if not corporate existence of these nikāyas in the eastern regions of India.

I-tsing is not alone in giving this number of the major sectarian divisions of Indian Buddhism. The Samayabhedoparacanacakre-nikāyabhedo-padarśanasaṅgraha, attributed to Vinītadeva, an abbot of the Nālandā monastery who lived in about the eighth century, refers to the same fourfold division of the saṅgha into the Mahāsaṅghika, Sarvāstivāda, Sthavira and

---

[1] I-tsing, A record of the Buddhist religion (J. Takakusu) pp.8-9.

the Sammitīya nikāyas and lists the other nikāyas as their sub-divisions.[1] Similarly, the Tibetan lists in the Varṣārgapṛcchāsūtra, translated in the eleventh century, follow the same pattern in listing the eighteen nikāyas under these four principal groups.[2] These four main schools are also mentioned in the fourteenth-century History of Buddhism of Bu-ston.[3] The accuracy of the classification of the less important nikāyas as sub-groups of the four principal nikāyas may arouse dispute. But the testimony of our sources leaves little doubt that the Mahāsaṅghikas, Sarvāstivādins, Sthaviras and the Sammitīyas rose into the position of the four principal nikāyas of the Buddhist saṅgha by about the seventh century and continued to hold this position for a considerable period of time.

In this context, it is interesting to note that the inscription from the Abhayagiri monastery uses the term cāturmahānikāya or 'the four principal nikāyas'. When this term is considered in the light of the foregoing discussion, it seems reasonable to interpret it as a reference to the Mahāsaṅghikas, Sarvāstivādins, Sthaviravādins and the Sammitīyas who had emerged as the four principal nikāyas in India. The statement in the inscription would imply twenty-five monks from each of these nikāyas were to live together at a hermitage attached to the Abhayagiri monastery. Most probably, it was the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery who represented the Sthaviravādins in this context. Unlike the residents of the

---

[1] A. Bareau, 'Trois traites sur les sectes bouddhiques des a Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinitadeva', JA 1954 pp. 229-233. Les sectes... p.24.

[2] Bareau, Les sectes.... p.26.

[3] These lists are also quoted by Bu-ston. See Bu-ston, op.cit. Pt. II pp. 98-100.

Mahāvihāra, the monks of the Abhayagiri fraternity had always been tolerant of and even receptive to the teachings of the non-Theravādin schools of Buddhism. As early as in the third century, they welcomed the teachings of the Vetullas.[1] Hiuen-tsang noted that they '...studied both Vehicles and widely diffused the Tripiṭaka..' unlike the monks of the Mahāvihāra who were 'opposed to the Great Vehicle'.[2] The close relationship which prevailed between the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery and particularly the Mahāsaṅghikas is reflected in a comment of the exegetist Sumaṅgala on a 'heretical view' jointly held by the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Abhayagirivāsins.[3]

The practice of different nikāyas living together at the same monastery was not unknown as evident from the Chinese and Tibetan accounts of the Buddhist scholastic tradition prevalent in the eastern regions of India. It has already been mentioned that the rather incoherent statement of I-tsing seems to point to the friendly co-existence of the four nikāyas. This gains further strength from the evidence in the Blue Annals. This work records the tradition that Dīpaṅkaraśrijñāna, an abbot of the Vikramaśīla monastery, studied the Canons of the four nikāyas. Further, this text states that the Tibetan scholar Rwa lo-tsā-ba rDo-rje-grags sent one hundred srans of gold to the Vikramaśīla monastery as an endowment to pay for the regular recitation of the Ārya-Prajñāpāramitāsañcayagāthā

---

[1] Mv., 36.41.

[2] Beal, op.cit. Vol. IV p.443.

[3] Abhidhammatthavikāsini p.46. See also p.526

by 'eighty-four panditas of the four nikayas'.[1] These statements seem to suggest that the Vikramaśīla monastery was an institution where the monks representing the four nikāyas lived and that it was a centre which encouraged the comparative study of their teachings.

The Cūlavaṃsa recorded that the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Theriyas were given the Vīraṅkurārāma built at the Abhayagiri monastery. According to the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, a monk belonging to a 'heretical' school settled at the Viraṅkurārāma and won over the king to his cause; the śāstras like the Ratnakūṭa were also brought to Ceylon during the same reign. The Abhayagiri inscription records that monks from four nikāyas at least one of which represented a school of thought distinct from the Theravāda lived at a hermitage attached to the Abhayagiri monastery; it also makes special provision for the study of the śāstras by forty monks. On considering these remarkable instances of corroboration, it seems reasonable to suggest that all these three sources - the two chronicles and the inscription - are speaking of the same incident and to hold that the inscription dates back to the reign of Sena I. This dating, as pointed out earlier, is supported by palaeographic considerations, too.

The Ratnakūṭa or the Pao-chi is one of the seven categories of the Mahāyāna class of the Sūtra Piṭaka in the Chinese Buddhist Canon. It contains a collection of forty-nine sūtras. The parallel division in the Tibetan Canon, the dkon-brtseg, has forty-eight sutras; some editions have

---

[1] G. N. Roerich, The Blue Annals, Pt. I pp. 243, 377.

only forty-five.[1] Edgerton has pointed out that the Kāśyapa Parivarta is sometimes called the Ratnakūṭa.[2] Most of the works in the Ratnakūṭa class are short tracts dealing with a single problem but some like the Piṭāputrasamāgama are analytical treatises of considerable extent.[3] In this connection, it is interesting that a number of copper plaques discovered at the Indikaṭusāya stūpa at Cetiyagiri, a monastery which was under the control of the Abhayagiri nikāya, have been found to contain quotations from the Kāśyapa Parivarta.[4] These are written in the Sinhalese script; Paranavitana believes that they may belong to the eighth or the ninth century.[5] Hence the tradition the scriptures of the Ratnakūṭa class were brought to Ceylon seems to have had a historical basis.

Another piece of important information found in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya is that the Vājiriyavāda was introduced into the Island in the reign of Sena I. The 'heretic' who won over the king belonged to the Vajraparvata sect.[6] The term Vajraparvata is sometimes used in place of Vājiriya;[7] the two seem to be synonymous. Eliot is probably right in equating Vājiriya with Vajrayāna.[8] Some of the most important centres of Tantric and

---

[1] Charles Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism Vol. III pp. 282, 283, 374.

[2] Edgerton, op.cit. Vol. II p.374.

[3] C. V. Murti, Central Philosophy of Buddhism p.86.

[4] EZ Vol. III pp. 199-212, 238-242.

[5] EZ Vol. III p.200.

[6] No information on a sect by this name is available. In the Avatamsaka Sūtra, there is a reference to a place called the Vajraparvata situated in the sea where bodhisattvas used to congregate. Taisho Tripiṭaka, Vol. X, p. 241b.

[7] Niks. p.10.

[8] Eliot op.cit. Vol. III p.40.

Vajrayāna teachings were found in the eastern regions of India. According to the Tibetan accounts, the abbots of the Vikramaśīla monastery from the time of Buddhaśrījñāna were famous vajrācāryas.[1] The possibility of Tāntric teachings being brought to Ceylon from the eastern regions of India is strengthened by the discovery of some stone slabs bearing Tāntric dhāraṇīs found within the Abhayagiri monastery and not far from the site of the inscription under discussion. Paranavitana has described the script as a form of Nāgari used in eastern India in about the ninth century.[2] Probably these Tantric influences came through Indian monks from the centres of Buddhist learning in eastern India or Ceylonese monks who had lived at these monasteries.

The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya states that the 'heretic' came from India. There is no indication of the particular region of his origin. It also mentions that the Ratnakūṭaśāstras were originally the work of the Andhakas.[3] Buddhaghosa used the term Andhaka to denote such schools as the Pubbaseliyas, Aparaseliyas, Rājagiriyas and the Siddhatthakas who, as evident from the testimony of the inscriptions and the reports of Hieun-tsang, flourished in the Kistna delta, especially near Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.[4] However, by the ninth century, these texts were fairly well spread. I-tsing, for instance, writes of a certain Rāhulamitra, a monk from a monastery at Tāmralipti, who devoted himself to the study of

---

[1] Schiefner op.cit. pp. 257-261.

[2] ARASC 1940-1945 p.41.

[3] Niks. p.10.

[4] Kathāvatthupakaraṇaṭṭhakatha' Jnl. of the Pali Text Society 1889 p.52. EI Vol. XX pp. 17, 20, 22, 23; Vol. XXI p.66. Beal op.cit. pp. 423-424. Bareau op.cit. pp.99, 104.

the Ratnakūṭa works.[1] The prevalence of the idea of the corporate existence of the four nikāyas in the eastern regions of India, the prevalence of close relations between this region and Ceylon and the palaeographic peculiarities of the relevant inscriptions at the Abhayagiri monastery strongly suggest the probability that the inspiration came from the Bihar-Bengal area.

The Abhayagiri inscription and the chronicles seem to record an interesting and important incident in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon. It is evident from the information they provide that monks belonging to schools other than the Theravāda like the Sarvāstivādins, Sammitīyas and more certainly the Mahāsaṅghikas lived in Ceylon. Apparently, an experiment was tried at the Abhayagiri monastery to provide for the corporate existence within one hermitage of representatives of these four principal nikāyas of the Buddhist saṅgha and to initiate a tradition of assiduous comparative study of their teachings without affiliation to any one of them. This was not necessarily the first instance when the teachings of these schools and Tāntrism were introduced to Ceylon.[2] But it was probably the first systematic attempt made with royal patronage to absorb these elements into the local Buddhist traditions. Presumably, the monks representing the schools other than the Theravadins came from India. It is not possible to be certain about this. But the evidence in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya and the fact

---

[1] I-tsing, op.cit. pp. 63-64.

[2] When Amoghavajra visited Ceylon in the eighth century, Samantabhadra, a Tāntrist of great repute, performed the Vajradhātu and Garbhadhātu ceremonies. Amoghavajra and his two disciples learned the secrets of the five abhisecanī from him. This would testify to the prevalence of Tāntric practices in Ceylon before the events under discussion. See W. Pachow, UCR Vol. XII p.182.

that the rules of residence and monastic administration in the Abhayagiri inscription are in Sanskrit and not in Sinhalese as usual may support this supposition.

Sena II, the next king, did not welcome this type of foreign 'heretical' influence, if the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya[1] is to be believed. This chronicle states that he set up guards all round the coast to prevent the entry of 'pseudo-Buddhist monks'. To substantiate this statement, the chronicler quotes a strophe allegedly from the Cūlavaṃsa; but this strophe is not found in the present recensions of the Cūlavaṃsa.

Even if Sena II did take such steps, they would not have been permanent Tāranātha relates an account of the visit to Ceylon of Ratnākaraśānti (Śānti-pa), one of the most prominent Vajrayānists in Eastern India. At the time of his visit to Ceylon, Ratnākaraśānti was the abbot of the Somapurī monastery the site of which has been identified with the ruins at Paharpur.[2] He came to Ceylon with an envoy despatched by the king of Ceylon to fetch him and brought along two hundred texts of the Mahāyāna school. He preached in the Island for seven years and, on his return to India, left behind five hundred monks of the Mahāyāna school. During his stay in Ceylon, Tāranātha maintains, the sūtra schools[3] gained wide popularity. On his return to India, he was requested by the king to live at the Vikramaśīla monastery and was assigned the post of a dvārapaṇḍita.[4]

---

[1] Niks. p.21.

[2] ARASI 1927-8 pp. 105-6.

[3] This refers to the sūtra schools of Mahāyāna Buddhism as distinct from the tantra schools.

[4] Grünwedel, op.cit. pp. 106-7.

The historicity of Ratnākaraśānti need not be held to question. He finds mention in the Blue Annals as the dvārapaṇḍita of the eastern gate of the Vikramaśīla monastery and a teacher of great renown.[1] As the only known account which gives biographical details about him is the work of Tāranātha, the evidence about his visit to Ceylon cannot be verified. But it is clear from this account that Tāranātha had at least two earlier histories before him. He mentions that they differed on the name of the Indian king who patronised Ratnākaraśānti.[2] The silence of the chronicles of Ceylon does not invalidate the evidence of Tāranātha as it is only very rarely that they concern themselves with the affairs of the 'heretics'. Hence it would be unwise to reject his testimony as a mere legend in a late chronicle. The visit of a famous teacher like Ratnākaraśānti, if it in fact did take place, would have greatly strengthened the position of the Mahāyāna schools of Ceylon.

Information in Tāranātha's chronicle is not very helpful in fixing the date of Ratnākaraśānti. According to him, the king who patronised the scholar was given in certain traditions as Mahīpāla (c.988-1038 A.D.) while other chronicles identified him with another king named Canaka. Tāranātha was inclined to accept the second view;[3] but there is no information on the chronological position of this king. However, the account of the life

---

[1] Roerich op.cit. Pt. I pp. 205-6.

[2] Grünwedel op.cit. p.107.

[3] Ibid.

of the Tibetan translator 'brog-mi which appears in the Blue Annals helps us to arrive at a fairly reliable dating'. Brog-mi is said to have left his monastery to study in India when the lo-tsā-ba Rin-chen bzaṅ-po was nearing the age of fifty. At Vikramaśīla, he studied the Vinaya under Ratnākarśānti who was a dvārapaṇḍita at the time.[1] In an earlier context, the chronicle records that Rin-chen bzaṅ-po was born in a year corresponding to 957 A.D.[2] This implies that Ratnākaraśānti was already a well-known teacher at Vikramaśīla by the beginning of the eleventh century; his visit to Ceylon should have taken place in the latter part of the tenth century.

The Cūlavaṃsa refers to many scholars from Jambudīpa who came in the reign of Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110). The king welcomed them and pleased them with gifts of money.[3] It is not impossible that some of these scholars were Buddhist monks from the eastern regions of India. Finds from the relic chamber of the Mahiyaṅgaṇa stūpa testify to the continuity of the relationship with this region. Among these finds was a figure of the Buddha cut in relief on a plaque of black basalt. On its back, the Ye dharmā ....formula was inscribed 'in Nāgarī characters of the Pāla period'. As Paranavitana pointed out, the finds seem to have been deposited in the stūpa during restorations undertaken during the reign of Vijayabāhu I.[4]

---

[1] Roerich op.cit. pp. 206-7.

[2] Ibid., p.123.

[3] Cv., 60.19.

[4] ARASC 1951 p.17.

Apart from the scholars who came to Ceylon to propagate their teachings, it is possible that there were some who came to study at the monasteries of Ceylon. When the Burmese monk Chapaṭa was in Ceylon, he found a young monk from Tāmalitti (Tāmralipti) who had come to study the teachings of the Mahāvihāra school.[1] It may be surmised that, in later times, the Muslim invasions and the political turmoils that India witnessed would have promoted migrations of scholars to places like Ceylon. In his Niśśaṅka-dāna-vinoda-maṇḍapa inscription, Niśśaṅka Malla claims to have distributed gifts among many people who had come from foreign lands.[2] However, there is no information in the Indian or Tibetan chronicles on such a migration of monks or scholars to Ceylon.

The close relations that the monasteries of Eastern India maintained with Nepal and Tibet during this period would have enabled visitors from Ceylon to come into contact with the religieux from these regions. Two manuscripts found in Nepal show that Ceylon was known and regarded by the Buddhists of Nepal as an important centre of Buddhism. One was written at the Śri Hlam monastery in a year corresponding to 1015 A.D.[3] The manuscript contains many miniature paintings dating from the twelfth century or earlier. Three of them represent cult objects from Ceylon. One is a painting of the Buddha Dīpaṅkara attended by two figures identified by Foucher as

---

[1] See p. 404.

[2] EZ Vol. II pp. 123-125.

[3] Cambridge University Library MS No. Add 1643. See also A. Foucher, Études sur l'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde pp. 15-27.

Avalokiteśvara and Vajrapāni; another depicts Jambhala while the third carries the figure of 'Ārogyaśālā Lokanātha'.[1] The second manuscript is a copy of the Prajñāpāramitā made by a resident of the Kisa... monastery in a year corresponding to 1071 A.D. This manuscript, too, contains three minatures representing images from Ceylon: Dīpaṅkara attended by Vajrapāni, Jambhala and 'Ārogyśāla Lokeśvara'.[2] In both the paintings of 'Ārogyaśalā Lokanātha (or Lokeśvara)' he is attended by two female figures, one executed in red and the other in green. Perhaps, these paintings were based on reports of Nepalese pilgrims who visited Ceylon. It is also possible that some of the Sinhalese monks who visited Eastern India ventured as far as the native land of the Buddha. But one cannot rule out the possibility that they were based on mere hearsay, on impressions gathered in Eastern India where visitors from the two lands met.

The Blue Annals record a tradition about a saintly monk from Ceylon who, it would appear, lived in the twelfth century. A monk from Kashmir who heard of his fame visited him in the town of Ratnacūḍāmaṇi.[3] Through him, the Sinhalese monk sent greetings to the Tibetan monks, Rin-chen-dpal and dbOn'-ston Rin-po-che whom he very much admired. This story is found in another Tibetan work where the name of the Sinhalese monk is given as Guṇaratna.[4] More reliable evidence on the relationship which

---

[1] Cambridge University Library MS. No. Add 1643 ff. 8, 80, 86. Foucher, op.cit., p.79.

[2] Foucher, op.cit., pp. 27-30.

[3] No information on a town of this name is available.

[4] Roerich op.cit. Pt. I p.315; Pt. II p.599. These Tibetan monks are said to have lived in the latter part of the twelfth century.

prevailed between Tibet and Ceylon during this period is to be found in two Sinhalese manuscripts discovered by Rāhul Sankṛtyāyāna in the Tibetan monastery of Sa-skya. One of these texts, incorrectly identified as the Vessantarajātaka by Sanṛtyāyana,[1] seems to be a work not known at present in Ceylon. The sections of this text which have been read so far deal with many topics varying from mutual duties of teachers and students, the advantages of patronising the saṅgha, the disadvantages of desire, and life in heaven and hell to a discussion on the 'perfections' (pāramitā).[2] The script of the manuscript is comparable to the palaeographic forms of the period from the eleventh to the thirteenth century compiled by P. E. E. Fernando; his comments on the peculiarities of the script of this period are also applicable in this case.[3] The round form of the initial a is similar to the illustrations nos. 13 and 14 in his table. The cerebral na is formed of a small circle followed by two loops. The dental na with the triangular base is quite similar to his illustration number 13 while the ma is similar to his examples 15 and 16 which he has described as typical of this period. It is also noteworthy that the ra of this manuscript has not developed the short curve on the top of the letter which seems to be a characteristic feature of the manuscripts of the thirteenth and later centuries.[4] Hence, it is

[1] Jnl. of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 1937 p.32.

[2] The present writer is indebted to Ven. H. Saddhātissa through whose good offices he has been able to obtain photographic copies of this manuscript. In examining this work, the possibility that it is one of the lost works of the Abhayagiri nikāya has to be kept in mind.

[3] P. E. E. Fernando, 'Development of the Sinhalese scriptfrom the 8th century A.D. to the 15th century A.D.', UCR Vol. VIII pp. 222-243 (with two tables).

[4] Ibid., p.239.

possible to suggest that the manuscript should be dated to about the twelfth century. Presumably, Rāhul Sankṛtyāyana is reporting information available in sources preserved at the Sa-skya monastery when he says that the two Sihhalese manuscripts belonged to Anantaśrī, a Ceylonese monk who visited the monastery in the time of Grag-pa rgyal-tshan.[1] According to the Blue Annals, Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan occupied the chair of the monastery in the year corresponding to 1172 A.D. He died in 1216 A.D.[2] It is evident from the foregoing discussion that the palaeographic evidence agrees with this date. Therefore, the tradition quoted by Sankṛtyāyana probably has a historical basis.

In considering the importance of the relations that Ceylon had with the northern centres of Buddhism, it is necessary to draw a distinction between Eastern India and the other centres in Nepal and Tibet. A Sinhalese monk or pilgrim who occasionally found his way to Nepal or Tibet is unlikely to have exerted an influence of considerable magnitude; nor is any such influence evident. The same comment applies to the rare visitors from these regions who may have reached Ceylon. On the other hand, there is reason to believe that the relations with the Bihar-Bengal area were established on a much more regular basis. The practice of going on pilgrimage to sacred places in this area and the existence of a permanent body of Sinhalese monks at the monastery of Buddha Gayā provided an opportunity to absorb the influences disseminated by the centres of Buddhist

---

[1] Jnl. of the Bihar and Orissa Res. Soc. 1937 p.32.

[2] Roerich, op.cit. Pt. I p.211.

learning in this area as also to possibly propagate the teachings of the Theravāda. There is hardly any doubt that the influence of the monastic centres of Eastern India which spread to Tibet and South East Asia also stimulated the development of Mahāyāna and Tantrism in the Island. The decline and the final destruction of the great monasteries in the Bengal-Bihar area would have severely affected the strength of the influence of these sects in the Island and the position of the monasteries which harboured their teachings.

Apart from the inscriptions written in a script which shows a resemblance to that used in Eastern India, there is reason to believe that the East Indian influence was felt on the Buddhist sculpture of Ceylon. Paranavitana has drawn attention to the affinity in style between the nāga figures at the Ratanapāsāda in the Abhayagiri monastery and the sculptures of the Pāla period.[1] A figure of Avalokiteśvara from the Nevill Collection of the British Museum may be cited as another example. This figure with a roundish face, Mongoloid in its appearance, is seated in the maharājalīla on a lotus pedestal. It has a dhyāni-buddha on the head-dress. A lotus is held in the left hand; the right is in the varada mudrā. An inscription stating that it was 'given by saṅgha (sanghadattah)' had been indited on the pedestal. Wickremasinghe who read this inscription has pointed out that it bears a close similarity in its palaeographic forms to the Abhayagiri Sanskrit inscription discussed above; both inscriptions seem to have been

[1] UHC Vol. I Pt. I p.404.

written in the script of the East Indian regions of the ninth century.[1] Hence, it can be suggested with justification either that this sculpture was brought from Eastern India of the Pāla period or that it was the work of a sculptor trained in the traditions of this region.

It has been suggested that the group of images at the Galvihāra at Polonnaruva bears some resemblance to the works of the Pāla period.[2] But it is not advisable to attribute them exclusively to the North Indian tradition as some of their characteristics like the technique of representing the folds of the robes by 'double grooves', the decoration of the back of the seat in the form of a makaratorana, the use of the 'flame' design to decorate the haloes and the method of depicting the padmāsana as a thin cushion on the pedestal are found in sculptures discovered at Nāgapaṭṭana.[3] They represent perhaps influences of both these regions with which Ceylon maintained close relations.

Relations between the Buddhist communities of South India and Ceylon had always been very close. For, as in Ceylon, Buddhism of the Sthaviravāda school thrived well in the Dravida land. Hiuen-tsang recorded that there were about a hundred monasteries with ten thousand monks of the Sthavira school in the Ta-lo-pi-ch'a (Dravida) country.[4] It is possible that the

---

[1] Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, 'Mahayana Buddhist images from Ceylon and Java', JRAS 1909 pp. 283-297 pl. I fig. 2.

[2] P. E. E. Fernando, 'Tantric influences on the sculptures at Galvihara, Polonnaruva', UCR Vol. XVIII Nos. 1 & 2 pp. 50-67.

[3] T. N. Ramachandran, The Nāgapaṭṭanam and other Buddhist bronzes in the Madras Museum, Pls. I & XVIII.

[4] Beal, op.cit. p.429.

position of Buddhism in South India was affected by the rise of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism as militant religious movements contesting the tenets of both Jainism and Buddhism. Evidence on the rivalry between these religious communities is preserved in Tamil literary works like the Periya-purāṇam, Tiruvātavūrar-purāṇam, Kuruparamparai and the Tirumālai. Tiruñānacampantar is said to have defeated the Buddhist inhabitants of the village Potimaṅkai in a debate; subsequently they were converted to Śaivism.[1] According to the Tiruvātavūrar-purāṇam, Māṇikkavācakar, another Śaivanāyaṇār entered into a dispute at Citaṃbaram where he defeated a Buddhist monk from Ceylon.[2] Evidently, the militant propogationary activities of the āḻvārs and the nāyaṇārs did not provoke the development of a similar enthusiastic movement on the part of the Buddhists to counter the growing influence of the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava faiths. It is possible to surmise that the decline of the influence of Buddhism led to migrations of South Indian monks to more salubrious surroundings in nearby countries like Ceylon.[3]

The important centres of Buddhism in the Coromandel coast survived this difficult period to play an active role in the subsequent history of Buddhism. Of these, Kāñci had risen into importance in the time of the Pallavas; but its importance and influence outlasted the political power of the Pallavas. As late as in the fourteenth century, the Nāgara-Kĕr

---

[1] H. W. Schomerus, Śivatische Heligenlegenden (Periyapurāṇa and Tiruvātavūrar purāṇa) Jena, 1925 p. 155.

[2] Ibid. pp. 264-280.

[3] See p. 375.

tāgama refers to Buddhāditya, a monk from the Saḍwihāra at Kāñci who wrote a panegyric in praise of the Javanese king Hayam Wuruk.[1] The port of Nāgapaṭṭana (Negapatam), situated further to the south at the mouth of the Kāverī was another important centre which attracted pilgrims and scholars from many regions. The commentator Dhammapāla the Senior lived at the Dhammāsokamahārāja monastery at Nāgapaṭṭana at the time of the composition of the commentary on the Nettipakaraṇa.[2] Buddhadatta, an earlier commentator, lived for sometime at Kāverīpaṭṭana, another port nearby.[3] It was at Nāgapaṭṭana that two monasteries were built in the time of the Coḷas by Māravijayottuṅgavarman, the king of Śrīvijaya.[4] More than three hundred Buddhist images dating from about the ninth to about the seventeenth century were found here revealing that it was an active centre of Buddhism for a very long period.

The influence of Buddhism was by no means restricted to the Coromandel coast; it spread across the central highlands into the Malabar coast. A copper plate from Vedāraṇyam, inscribed in a script datable to about the tenth century, records a grant of land made to a Buddhist monastery called Sundaracoḷaperumpaḷḷi built by one Selettiyan.[5] According to an

---

[1] Theodore G. Th. Pigeaud, Java in the 14th century, a study in cultural history (The Nāgara-Kertāgama by Rekawi Prapañca) Vol. III p.111; Vol. IV pp. 331-333.

[2] Nettipakaraṇa (PTS) p.249.

[3] Madhuratthavilāsinī (PTS) p.299.

[4] EI Vol. XXII p.242 ll.80-84.

[5] P. R. Sirinivasan, The story of Buddhism, 1956 p.158.

inscription from the Shikarpur taluk, a Buddhist monastery with shrines for Tārā, Lokeśvara, Keśava and the Buddha was built at Balligāve (Belugami) in 1055 A.D. It was most probably a Tantric institution; for endowments were made for the maintenance of yoginīs.[1] A record from the same taluk dated in 1098 A.D. mentions another Buddhist shrine.[2] The monastery of Mūlavāsa located in the Malabar coast[3] was well known among the Nepalese Buddhists of the eleventh century as an important centre of Buddhism in the Dakṣiṇāpatha.[4] A number of Buddha images datable to the Cōḷa period have been in many places spread over this area like Tyaganur, Tanjor, Kāñci, Tiruvatti, Tiruvalanjuli, Elaiyur, Jayakoṇḍacoḷapuram, Manambady and Karadikkuppam.[5] It has already been pointed out that the images from Nāgapaṭṭana testify to the survival of Buddhism into the seventeenth century. This is confirmed by certain inscriptions of the Yādavas of Devagiri, the Vijayanagara kings and of the Nāyakkas of Tanjore.[6] Even if it cannot be said that Buddhism was in a flourishing state, it is quite clear that it was very much alive at many South Indian centres during the period under review.

---

[1] Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. VII Shikarpur taluk No. 170.

[2] Ibid. No. 106.

[3] Travancore Archaeological Series, Vol. II pp. 115-123.

[4] Foucher, op.cit. p.194.

[5] Sirinivasan, op.cit. pp. 62-101.

[6] MRE 1927 No. 292; 1927/8 No. 66; 1939/40 No. 144.

The friendly relations between the Buddhist communities of South India and Ceylon can be traced back to a very early period. Many stories in the Sīhalavatthu-pakaraṇa and the Sahassavatthu-pakaraṇa speak about Sinhalese monks who visited South India; the port of Kāveripaṭṭana occurs frequently in these stories. Monks who were banished from the Island for adherence to the teachings of the Vetullavāda sought refuge in the Coḷa land where they found friends who were ready to come to Ceylon to vindicate their position.[1] South Indian commentaries like the Andhakaṭṭhakathā were studied by commentators in Ceylon. The works of Buddhadatta and Dhammapāla the Senior are products of the relationship which existed between these two countries. It has been suggested that Ānanda, the author of the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā, and Anuruddha, the author of the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha, were Indians. In the colophon of the Paramatthavinicchaya, the author states that his birthplace was Kāveri.[2]

The close contact between the Buddhist communities of the Coromandel coast and of Ceylon would have continued till the end of the tenth century when friendly relations were vitiated by political developments which led to the conquest of Rājaraṭṭha by the Coḷas. When Vijayabāhu I restored the Sinhalese power over Rājaraṭṭha, it was to Burma and not to South India that he sent envoys to obtain monks to restore the sāsana in the Island. This, too, has to be partly explained by political reasons;[3] presumably,

---

[1] Mv., 36.111-3.

[2] Paramatthavinicchaya (Devānanda) p.337.

[2] Paramatthavinicchaya (Devānanda) p.337.

[3] See also p.399

friendly relations between the two countries had not been established by this time.

A strophe in a fragmentary inscription from Polonnaruva, probably issued in the reign of Vikkamabāhu I, mentions a hierarch by the name of Ānanda who is compared to 'a banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā'. The last two pādas of the strophe which are readable only in part refer to his connections with the saṅgha of Tambaraṭṭha and of the Coḷa land.[1] He was no doubt an important monk to receive the patronage of the queenof Vikkamabāhu at a time when the royalty were not well disposed towards the saṅgha. Buddhappiya, a monk from the Coḷa kingdom, who claims to have presided over 'two or three monasteries including Bālādicca (Bālāditya)' states in the colophon of the Rūpasiddhi, a Pali grammar he wrote, that he was a disciple of Ānanda, 'the banner of Tambapaṇṇi'.[2] The commentary on the Rūpasiddhi adds that Cūḷamaṇikarma was one of the monasteries which came under Buddhappiya's control.[3] This may be identified with the Cuḍāmaṇivarma monastery built at Nāgapaṭṭana by the king of Śrīvijaya.[4] Buddhappiya claims to have made the sāsana shine. Perhaps he is identical with the monk of the same name who is mentioned in the Vimativinodanī as one of the leading figures who took part in the 'purification' of the Order in the Dravida lands, suppressing loose interpretations of the Vinaya rules.[5]

---

[1] EZ Vol. IV pp. 71-2.

[2] Mahārūpasiddhi sannaya (Sumaṅgala and Dhammaratana, 1891) p.444.

[3] Ibid.

[4] EI Vol. XXII p.242 l.83.

[5] Vimativinodanī (Dharmādhāra) p.100.

Paranavitana is probably right in identifying the teacher of Buddhappiya with the hierarch Ānanda of the Polonnaruva record.[1] If this is accepted, it could be cited as one of the important examples of the relationship which prevailed between the saṅgha of Nāgapaṭṭana and of Polonnaruva.

During the ten years he spent in Ceylon, the Burmese monk Chapata met Ānanda, a monk from Kāñci who was versed in the three piṭakas.[2] Two Coḷa monks, Buddhamitta and Kassapa, were in Ceylon in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.[3] Little is known about Buddhamitta. Kassapa, probably identical with the author of the Vimativinodanī and the Mohavicchedanī, lived at the time he composed the latter work at the Nāgānana monastery in Coḷādhināthapura, situated in the middle of the Coḷa country. Warder has identified Coḷādhināthapura with Nāgapaṭṭana.[4] But Nāgapaṭṭana is known in Coḷa inscriptions as Coḷakulavaḷḷipaṭṭana.[5] The statement that Coḷādhināthapura was situated in the middle of the Coḷa kingdom also suggests that it should be located further inland. Kassapa criticizes the Sinhalese hierarch Sāriputta for giving a too permissive interpretationof the rule on the consumption of liquor. This interpretation, he points out, had encouraged lapses in discipline in the Coḷa land and had been rejected as an 'unorthodox' interpretation by the leading monks of that country. They

---

[1] Paranavitana, Jnl of the Gtr. Ind. Soc. Vol. XI, 1944 pp. 17-25.

[2] See p. 404

[3] See p. 223

[4] Mohavicchedanī (PTS) p.xvi.

[5] EI Vol. XXII p.242, l.83.

cleansed the saṅgha of monks who supported such views.[1]

This criticism is important as it reveals the influence that the views of the Ceylonese bore on the clergy of the Coḷa land. It is also evident from this that the South Indian monks claimed to be more 'orthodox' than their Ceylonese counterparts. Kassapa accuses Sāriputta for having been influenced by the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery. It is also possible that this criticism indicates something more than mere disagreement; it is possible to detect traces of regional rivalry in some of these writings. It is natural that the intense political rivalry and hostility between the Sinhalese and the Coḷa kingdoms that the reign of Parakkamabāhu I witnessed would find expression in the writings of this period. The author of the Sīmālaṅkara, a work on the problems of demarcating ceremonial boundaries, claims to have vindicated the position of the Sinhalese monks. All those who knew the Vinaya rules and who wished for the perpetuation of the sāsana, he maintains, would accept the views of the Sinhalese monks which are in accordance with the scriptures and their commentaries; they would certainly reject the views of the Coḷiyans which are false and contrary to these. It was a Sinhalese monk called Vācissara, he declares at the end, who wrote this Sīmālaṅkāra and the commentary thereof.[2]

It was pointed out earlier that the thera Ānanda was described in the Polonnaruva record as a monk who had connections with the saṅgha of

---

[1] Vimativ., pp. 96-100; see also p. 523

[2] Sīmālaṅkara (Buddhasiri), 1904 pp. 42-3.

Tambaraṭṭha. Tambaraṭṭha finds mention in three other sources. According to its colophon, the Paramatthavinicchaya was written by Anuruddha, a monk born in 'the township of Kāvīra in the land of the city of Kāñci' who was living at the time of Tañja in Tambaraṭṭha.[1] The author of the Jinālaṅkāra speaks of his reputation among the learned men of Coḷiyatambaraṭṭha.[2] This could be interpreted either as the Coḷa land and Tambaraṭṭha or as Tambaraṭṭha in the Coḷa land. The third reference occurs in the Cūḷavaṃsa. Parakkamabāhu II sent two missions to foreign lands to obtain monks to help reorganize the Order in Ceylon. One of these missions was to the Coḷa kingdom. The other was sent to Tambaraṭṭha for the specific purpose of inviting Dhammakittāi, a monk reputedly of great virtue.[3]

Geiger was inclined to believe that Tambaraṭṭha should be located in South India.[4] One possibility is to identify Tañja with Tañjāvūr in the Coḷa country. But the context of the reference in the Cūḷavaṃsa precludes such an identification; it is clear from this that, at least in the thirteenth century, Tambaraṭṭha was distinct from the Coḷa country. For separate missions were sent to these two places.

Paranavitana has attempted to identify Tambaraṭṭha with the Ligor region of the Malay Peninsula.[5] He has pointed out that the Pūjāvaliya substitutes Tamaliṅgamu for Tambaraṭṭha in the account of the reign of

---

[1] Paramatthav., p.337. This statement seems to suggest that the Paramatthavinicchaya was written at a time when the town of Kāvīra was under the control of the Pallavas. If this be so, the work has to be dated to the ninth century or an earlier period.

[2] Jinālaṅkāra (R. Pālita) 1955 p.31.

[3] Cv., 84.9-16.

[4] Cv., trsl. Vol. II p.155 n.2.

[5] Jnl. of the Gtr. Ind. Soc. Vol. XI, 1944 pp.17-25. JRASCB(NS) Vol.VII Pt I p.5.

Parakkamabāhu III.[1] The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa mentions a certain invader by the name of Candabhānu who raided the Island in the time of Parakkamabāhu II. He came from Tambaliṅga.[2] The Ẹḷu-Attanagaluvaṃsaya, the fourteenth century Sinhalese translation of this work, gives Tamaliṅgamu in place of Tambaliṅga.[3] Coedès has identified Candabhānu with a king who bore this title mentioned in a Sanskrit inscription from Caiya.[4] Ostensibly, this would be very strong evidence for the identification of Tambaraṭṭha with the Caiya region. Paranavitana goes on to suggest that there was a 'Tanjong-pura somewhere in the Malay Peninsula which would very well have been the Taṅja-nagara referred to in the Paramatthavinicchaya'. 'There is also', he adds, 'a Tanjong Tembeling.'[5]

But a closer examination reveals that this identification is not as dependable as it would seem at first sight. For there seems to have been some confusion in the use of the name Tamaliṅgamu in the Sinhalese literary works. Further, there was more than one region round the Bay of Bengal which could have borne the name Tambaraṭṭha. The Saddharmālaṅkāraya relates a story about sixty Sinhalese monks who reached the roadstead of Tamliṅgamau on their way to the city of Pāḷalup (Pāṭalīputra).[6] In this

---

[1] Pjv., p.118.

[2] Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa (PTS) p.32.

[3] Ẹḷu āttanagḷuvaṃsaya (Simon de Silva) p.45.

[4] Coedès, Recueil des inscriptions du Siam Pt. II pp. 25-28.

[5] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VII Pt. I p.5.

[6] Saddharmālaṅkāraya (Bentoṭa Saddhātissa) p.361.

context, Tamaliṅgamu could hardly be any other place but the port of Tāmralipti. In fact, certain Sinhalese translations give Tamaliṅgam in place of Tāmalitti (Tāmralipti) in the Pali originals. According to the Saddharmaratnākaraya, the ship bearing the sapling of the Bo-tree touched at Tamaliṅgamtoṭa on its way from Buddha Gayā to Ceylon.[1] In place of Tāmalitti in the Dāṭhāvaṃsa, its Sinhalese gloss[2] gives Tamaliṅgam while the Daḷadāsirita retains the Pali form without change.[3]

Tāmralipti and Tāmraliṅga were not the only places which had names beginning with tāmra, meaning 'copper'. Tambadīparaṭṭha was a name used to denote a part of Burma. Dhammasenāpati, the Burmese monk who wrote the Kārikā, the Pali grammar, states in the colophon that he lived at Arimmaddanapura (Pagan) in the Tambadīparaṭṭha.[4] The Nighaṇḍuṭīkā was composed by a Burmese minister called Caturaṅgabala in about the fourteenth century. He mentions that he lived in the reign of Sīhasūra, the king of the Tambadīparaṭṭha.[5] G. H. Luce has quoted the Jambudīpa Uchavi to point out that the region to the east and the south of the Irrawaddy was known as Tambadīpa while the region to the north and west of it was called Sunāparanta.[6] This is supported by an inscription from the Shwezayan pagoda at

---

[1] Saddharmaratnākaraya (Kosgoḍa Ñānavimala) p.361.

[2] Halvegoḍa Sīlālaṅkāra ed. p.81 quoted by Paranavitana JRASCB(NS) Vol. VII Pt. I p.20.

[3] Daḷadāsirita (Sorata) p.32.

[4] Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. II p.481.

[5] Ibid. p.535.

[6] Journal of the Burma Research Society Vol. XLII p.39.

Thāton which mentions a king called Makuṭarāja who is described as the lord of 'the whole Tāmbāviseya'[1] Luce has identified Makuṭarāja with Manuhā, the contemporary of Anawrahta, who ruled over Lower Burma.[2] As Dupont has suggested, Tāmbāviseya may be compared with Tāmravisaya,[3] a term synonymous with the Pali Tambaraṭṭha.

The Mahābhārata mentions an island called Tāmra.[4] The Divyāvadāna, a too, refers to a certain Tāmradvīpa.[5] Edgerton has suggested that they denote Ceylon which was known at one time as Tambapaṇṇi (Skt. Tāmraparṇi).[6] The name of the South Indian river Tāmraparṇi goes back very much into the past and finds mention in the Vāyu-purāṇa.7 In the Matsya-purāṇa and Viṣṇu-purāṇa, Tāmraparṇa occurs as one of the nine divisions of the Bhāratavarṣa.[8] Probably, it is the same river which is mentioned in the Aśokan inscriptions.[9] It is possible that the land round this river was also known by the same name.

The foregoing discussion demonstrates the difficulties involved in accepting Paranavitana's suggestion that the Tambaraṭṭha of the Pali works should be identified with the Ligor region of the Malay Peninsula. This identification is based merely on the similarity of the names. But there were about five regions round the Bay of Bengal which did or could

[1] Pierre Dupont, L'archéologie Mons de Dvāravatī Vol. I p.9.

[2] G. H. Luce, Mons of the Pagan dynasty p.9.

[3] See f.n.1.

[4] Mbh., 2.28.46.

[5] Divyāvadāna (Cowell & Neil) p.525.

[6] Edgerton, op.cit. Vol. II p.251.

[7] Vāyu-purāṇa (Anandasrama), Poona, 1905, 77.24-5. See also Brahmaṇḍa-purāṇa (Sri Venkateśvasa Press, Bombay) 1912 II.16.36.

[8] Matsya-purāṇa (Anandasrama) Poona, 1907, 114,8. Viṣṇu-purāṇa (srī Venkateśvasa Press, Bombay) II.36.

[9] CII Vol. I pp. 3, 46.

have borne similar names. It could have been possible to rely on this identification if the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya which speaks of Tambaraṭṭha and Tamaliṅgamu as the home of Dhammakitti used these names also to denote the kingdom of Candabhānu. But this is not so; in these works, he is merely referred to as the king of the Jāvakas.[1]

Paranavitana has attempted to identify the town of Tañja mentioned in the Paramatthavinicchaya with Tanjong-pura which he presumed was in the Malay Peninsula. Chau-ju-kua mentions a certain Tan-jong-wou-lo as one of the dependancies of Java.[2] This has been interpreted by Coedès as a reference to Tanjong-pura.[3] A principal city called Tanjung-puri is listed among the tributaries and neighbours of the kingdom of Majapahit in the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama.[4] Pigeaud who edited this chronicle located Tanjung-puri in the island of Borneo.[5] Internal evidence from the chronicle supports this identification which has found general acceptance among scholars.

It is true that many places in the Malay Peninsula have the term Tanjong as a part of their conjoint names. For tanjong in the Malay language means 'cape' or 'promontory'. Tanjong-Tembeling, the place-name which Paranavitana cites to support his identification, merely means 'the headland of the river Tembeling'. Had the author of the Paramatthavinicchaya

---

[1] Pjv. p.117; Cv., 83.36-51.

[2] Hirth and Rockhill, Chau-ju-kua p.86.

[3] Coedès, Les états hindouisés.. p.340.

[4] Pigeaud, op.cit. Vol. III p.16.

[5] Ibid., Vol. IV p.31; see also pp. 128,230.

lived at one such place, it is very unlikely that he would have stated that he was living at Tañja without giving the actual name of the place.

No places bearing the name Tañja are known from Burma or the Tāmralipti area. On the other hand, there were at least two places by this name in South India. One of these was Tañjāvūr, modern Tanjore, which was the capital of the Coḷas for some time. But, as pointed out earlier, Tañja of the Tambaraṭṭha seems to have been outside the Coḷa country. Another city which bore this name is mentioned in the Tamil poem, the Tañcaivānankōvai. The work has been dated to the twelfth century by the editor, but it may be about two centuries later. The hero of the poem was a feudatory of the Pāṇḍyas. He ruled from the city of Tañcai which was situated near the Poḍiyil hills by the river Vaikai. It is described as 'Tañcai of the south', probably to distinguish it from Tañjāvūr in the north.[1]

Though it is possible that the Tambaraṭṭha of the Pali works is identical with Tāmraliṅga or the Ligor area of the Malay Peninsula the difficulties involved in accepting this hypothesis induces one to consider other possibilities. Tambaraṭṭha occurs in all its known contexts in association with South India, particularly the Coḷa country. This would suggest that it was situated close to the Coḷa country. The Tañja of the Paramatthavinicchaya could very well be identified with Tañcai in the Pāṇḍya country. It is easier to accept the suggestion that a monk who was

---

[1] Tañcaivānankōvai (S. R. Rāmasāmi Pillai) pp. 11, 16, 20, 27, 31, 310, 339.

born in Kāverī went to live in the Pāṇḍya country though it is not impossible, as Paranavitana has suggested, that he went to the Malay Peninsula. The evidence before us seems to favour the view that Tambaraṭṭha was in South India; but it is not strong enough to preclude the possibility of locating this region in South East India.

Almost all the evidence cited on the relations between the monastic centres of South India and Ceylon relate to contact s with the Coromandel coast. Further, they deal only with relations with centres which professed Theravāda faith. However, it is possible that important centres on the Malabar coast like the Mūlavāsa monastery were known in Ceylon. The contribution that South India made to the expansion of non-Theravāda teachings in Ceylon in an earlier period is evident from the Mahāvaṃsa and Mahāyānist records inscribed in the Pallava Grantha script like the Trikayāstava inscription from Mihintale.[1] The co-operation between the saṅgha of South India and Ceylon brought forth important results evident particularly in the Pali Buddhist works of this period. The introduction of South Indian elements into the Sinhalese monastic organization, too, has to be attributed, at least partly, to this relationship.[2]

Buddhism was at a low ebb at the accession of Vijayabāhu I; all the sources agree that it had been on the decline. It is possible that the neglect and lack of patronage during a long period of political turmoil

---

[1] EZ Vol. IV pp. 242-246; see also pp. 151-60.

[2] See p. 344.

forced the monks to give up robes or to seek shelter in centres of Buddhism outside the Island. The Pujāvaliya and the Rājāvaliya lay the blame on the Colas who, they maintain, tried to destroy the sāsana.[1] Vijayabāhu found it difficult to get together sufficient monks to hold ecclesiastical ceremonies like that of Ordination. This need not necessarily imply that the number of monks in the Island had been so severely diminished. Perhaps, it merely means that the monks who were available were not considered sufficiently virtuous or worthy to preside over such ceremonies. In fact, according to the Pujāvaliya the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, Vijayabāhu could not find 'even five virtuous monks'.[2] It is also possible that as in later times the ceremony of Ordination had fallen into abeyance and as a result the monks in the Island were not qualified to conduct it. The Velaikkāra nscriptions at Polonnaruvā which is the source closest to the events gives a slightly different account. According to this record, monks were invited from Arumaṇa (Rāmaññā) to 'purify' the saṅgha of the three nikāyas.[3]

The later Sinhalese chronicles agree with the statement that Vijayabāhu obtained monks from Aramaṇa. For this purpose, he is said to have sent emissaries bearing pearls and precious stones as presents. The Cūlavaṃsa adds a valuable piece of evidence in stating that it was to king Anuruddha that these emissaries were sent.[4] Geiger was inclined to question

[1] Pjv., p.105; Rjv. (Gunasekara) p.42.

[2] Pjv., p.105; Niks. p.23.

[3] EI Vol. XVIII p.338.

[4] Cv., 60.4-8.

the authority of the Cūlavaṃsa. He accepted the chronology worked out by Phayre which placed the reign of Anuruddha (Anawrahta) from 1010 to 1052 A.D. and remarked that the assumption of the contemporaniety of Anuruddha and Vijayabahu I was 'probably an arbitrary one on the part of the author of our part of the Mahāvaṃsa or of his source'.[1] But according to the Burmese chronology revised by Maung Hla, the reign of Anuruddha would fall between 1044 and 1077[2] and within the reign of Vijayabahu I (1055-1110). Hence there is reason to believe that the account in the Cūlavaṃsa was based on a reliable source of information.

According to the Cūlavaṃsa, the monks who came from Burma were thoroughly versed in the three piṭakas. They initiated numerous ceremonies of Admission and Ordination and rehearsed the scriptures and their commentaries.[3] The Pūjāvaliya and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya hold that the scriptures, too, were brought from Burma.[4] This would imply that apart from the decline in the standards of discipline, there was a shortage of books as well as of monks at the accession of Vijayabahu I. The accomplishments of the monks brought from Burma would seem to be nothing less than the re-establishment of Buddhism which had been severely affected during the period of foreign rule. But the silence of the Velaikkāra inscription on this point makes one rather hesitant about accepting this interpretation.

---

[1] Cv., trsl. Pt. I p.214 n.4.

[2] Maung Hla, 'The chronological tables of the kings of Burma', Jnl. Burm. Res. Soc. Vol. XIII p.82.

[3] Cv., 60.4-8.

[4] āgamayada genvā Pjv. p.105; patpot genvā Niks. p.23.

As evident from the Hmawza inscription dated to a period from about the fifth to the seventh century, Pali Buddhism was known in Upper Burma long before the reign of Anuruddha.[1] The Burmese chronicles Mahāyazawin and the Hmannān Yazawin[2] refer to the thriving community of monks of the Arañ (Ari) school who lived in the Mramma kingdom in the reign of Anuruddha. The capture of the city of Thäton (Sudhammapura) in Rāmaññadesa in c.1057 A.D. brought the Mramma conquerors into close contact with another school of Buddhism. Shin Arahan, a monk of this school, won over the sympathies of Anuruddha, the Mramma king, and eventually became his personal preceptor. Monks and the scriptures of this school were brought to his capital from the conquered Thäton.

According to the Ceylonese sources, the monks who officiated at the 'purification' of the Sinhalese saṁgha came from Rāmaññadesa[3]; probably they, too, like the monks who went to Pagan, came from Thäton. However, Quaritch Wales pointed out that no evidence has been found at Thäton to show that Buddhism flourished there before the eleventh century. It has been suggested that the monks found there were those who had been forced to leave the kingdom of Haripuñjaya by the invasion of Sūryavarman I or the cholera epidemic mentioned in the Cāmādevīvaṁsa.[4]

---

[1] Duroiselle, 'Excavations at Hmawza' ARASI 1928-9 pp. 105-7.

[2] Maha Yazawin (Saya Pwa) pp. 181-191. Hmannan Yazawin, translated into English as the Glass Palace Chronicle by Pe Maung Tin and G. H. Luce pp. 71-80.

[3] EI Vol. XVIII p.338.

[4] H. G. Quaritch Wales, 'Anuruddha and the Thäton tradition', JRAS 1947 p.152. See also Coedès, Les états hindouisés.... p.274.

As Paranavitana suggested, another possibility is that the monks brought to Ceylon in the reign of Vijayabāhu I were those who had originally gone from Ceylon or representatives of a community descended from them. He has pointed out that the inauguration of the ceremony of Ordination by these monks did not result in the establishment of a community named after Burma, as it happened later on when foreign monks were brought to initiate this ceremony.[1] It is also noteworthy that the Burmese annals do not refer to an instance of their monks taking part in a 'purification' of the Order in Ceylon in the time of Vijayabāhu I. On the other hand, they state that the Sinhalese clergy were in the line of direct descent from Mahinda.[2] The Sinhalese monks who were forced to leave the Island during the period of Coḷa rule would have gone to centres of Buddhism outside the Coḷa kingdom; it is quite possible that some of them went to Burma. The Cūḷavaṃsa testifies to the prevalence of close relations between the king of Rāmaññña and the Sinhalese military leaders who rose against the power of the Coḷas. The king of Rāmaññña is said to have sent aid to Vijayabāhu when the latter was engaged in campaigns against the Coḷas.[3] Most of the sources are not very helpful in determining the origin of the monks brought from Burma. The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya provides some additional information. According to the printed version edited by Amaramoli, twenty-

[1] UHC Vol. I Pt. II p.564.

[2] Indian Antiquary Vol. XXII p.29; Ep. Birm. Vol. III Pt. II p.189.

[3] Cv., 58.8-10.

five monks were brought by Vijayabāhu I; they are described as Aramaṇaraṭavāsi, 'residents of Aramaṇa'. The editor gives a variant reading - Aramaṇayaṭa vādi, 'those who had gone to Aramaṇa'.[1] All the four manuscripts of this text at the British Museum are unanimous in supporting the latter reading. They also state that the number of monks involved was twenty;[2] the Pujāvaliya gives the same number.[3] If the reading in the manuscripts is accepted, it would add strength to the contention that the monks brought to the Island in the time of Vijayabāhu I were in fact those who had originally gone to Burma in the Coḷa period or their descendants. But the evidence available is not strong enough to warrant a definite conclusion on this point.

The Burmese chronicles supply some more details about the relations between the two countries during this period. The Mahāyazawin records that Anuruddha sent a minister to Ceylon with an elephant as a present to the king to ask for the Tooth relic. But he had to be satisfied with a replica of the relic. He had several more replicas of the relic made and deposited them in shrines in various parts of the kingdom. The name of the Sinhalese king is given as Sirisaṅghabodhi; this was a title of Vijayabāhu I.[4] The authors of the Hmannān believed that the Mahāyazawin was wrong in respect of the last detail and concluded on the strength of the evidence from their

[1] Niks. p. 23 and note 1.

[2] British Museum MSS Or. 2702 f.ke; Or. 6606(10) f. kau; Or. 66606(11) f. kha; Or. 6606(48) f.ka.

[3] Pjv., p.105.

[4] Maha Yazawin p.202.

chronological calculations that the king should have been Dhātusena.[1] Obviously, the earlier chronicle was correct.

The Sāsanavaṃsa states that, after the capture of Thāton, Anuruddha sent four envoys to Ceylon to obtain copies of the tipiṭaks. These were compared with the scriptures brought from Thāton; they were found to be in complete agreement with each other.[2] N. R. Ray has accepted this account.[3] But the Sāsanavaṃsa is a late chronicle compiled only in the nineteenth century; this account does not occur in any of the earlier chronicles. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that Vijayabāhu would have had to obtain the scriptures from Burma if they had been sent to Anuruddha a few years earlier.

The close friendly relations between Burma and Ceylon evident in the reign of Anuruddha persisted after his death. The Burmese chronicles state that Kyanzittha, one of his successors, was sent nine relics by the king of Ceylon.[4] If the chronological position of Kyanzittha, between 1086 and 1112 as suggested by Maung Hla, is accepted, the Sinhalese king may be identified with Vijayabāhu I. During the reign of Narathu, a period marked by violence and political assassination, Panthagu,[5] the royal preceptor, was disgusted with the vile ways of the king and left the kingdom

---

[1] Hmannan pp. 89-90.

[2] Sāsanavaṃsa (B.C.Law) p.71.

[3] N. R. Ray, Theravāda Buddhism in Burma pp. 100-101.

[4] Maha Yazawin p.227; Hmannan p.110.

[5] As Than Tun has pointed out, Panthagu which is the equivalent of the Pali term pāṃsukūlika is a title rather than a name. Than Tun, The Buddhist Church in Burma in the Pagan Period (unpublished thesis) p.240.

in protest to live in exile in Ceylon. The king is also said to have attempted to laicize many monks who, too, were forced to flee to Ceylon.[1]

Such movements of monks from Ceylon to Burma and from Burma to Ceylon in times of political turmoil in either country would have promoted, and to some extent presuppose, friendly connections between the saṅgha of the two countries. These connections helped the saṅgha to intervene when hostilities broke out between Burma and Ceylon in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.[2] According to the Cūlavaṃsa, the saṅgha were instrumental in restoring the normal relations between the two kingdoms after the campaigns.[3]

The most well known of the visits of Burmese to Ceylon is perhaps the pilgrimage of Uttarajīva, the preceptor of Narapatisithu.[4] This monk arrived in Ceylon with a group of disciples among whom was one Chapaṭa, a novice he had met at the port of Kusīma (Bassein). Probably, it is this association with Chapaṭa which has added such importance to his visit. Accounts of this visit are preserved in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions and all in the Burmese chronicles. At a ceremony which both the Burmese and the Ceylonese participated, Chapaṭa received his Ordination. Uttarajīva held discussions with the Sinhalese monks and returned soon to Burma after worshipping at the important shrines. Chapaṭa decided to stay back to

---

[1] Maha Yazawin pp. 251-2; Hmannan p.133. Harvey has stated that Panthagu returned to Burma early in the reign of Narapatisithu and that he died at Pagan at the age of ninety. He has not cited any authorities. The present writer has found no evidence in the sources he consulted to support this statement. A certain Nga Sweshin Panthagu is mentioned in the account of the reign of Narapatisithu. But it is doubtful whether they are identical. See Harvey, History of Burma, 1925 p.55.

[2] See p.295

[3] Cv., 76.69-74.

[4] Cañsu (Sithu) in certain inscriptions and Narapatijayasūra in the Kalyāṇī inscriptions.

complete his studies.[1]

According to the Kalyāṇī inscriptions, the departure of Uttarajīva to Ceylon took place in the year 532 of the Burmese era and six years after the 'purification' of the saṅgha by Parakkamabāhu I, in 1165/6 A.D.[2] The date of Uttarajīva's visit would thus be in 1171/2 A.D. The years 526 and 532 of the Burmese era correspond approximately to the same years. Coedès has suggested that Uttarajīva brought the message of peace mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa which led to the cessation of hostilities between Burma and Ceylon.[3] The chronological evidence from our sources would, however, militate against the acceptance of this view. The war with Burma is mentioned in an inscription of Parakkamabāhu dated to the twelfth year of his reign, i.e. 1165/6. Nevertheless, it may be suggested that the visit of the preceptor of the Burmese king represents the restoration of friendly relations between the two kingdoms, even if he did not in fact bring the message of peace.

The young novice Chapaṭa[4] stayed in Ceylon for ten years and during this period mastered the three piṭakas together with their commentaries. On his return to Burma, he took with him four other monks from Ceylon who were also well versed in the scriptures. Of these monks, Rāhula was a

[1] Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXII p.29; Ep. Birm. Vol. III Pt. II pp. 189-190.

[2] Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXII p.29; see also p.295.

[3] Cv., 69.74; Coedès, Les états hindouisés... p.323.

[4] It has been suggested that Chapaṭa was the author of the grammatical treatise Suttaniddesa and of the Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā, the commentary on the Abhidhammattha-saṅgha (M. H. Bode, Pali literature of Burma pp. 17-18; Coedès, Les états hindouisés... p.323). Though the author of these works was a monk named Chappaṭa, the colophons of the works record that he visited Ceylon in the year 1990 of the Buddhist era (1446/7 A.D.) when a certain king Parakkamabāhu

(cont.)

a Ceylonese, Nanda was from Kāñci and Sīvalī from Tāmalitti (Tāmralipti) while Tāmalinda was the son of the king of Kāmboja. This group refrained from associating with the Burmese monks who were in Pagan and began to perform the eccleciastical ceremonies by themselves. This led to the rise of a separate school, the Sīhalasaṅgha, which drew its inspiration from the Sinhalese centres of Buddhism. They won over the support of Narapatisithu who held for them an Ordination ceremony on a raft of boats at which new recruits were admitted to this school.[1] This is reminiscent of the Ordination ceremony held under the patronage of Parakkamabahu I in a pavilion built on boats anchored in the middle of the river Mahavāli.[2] It was evidently a ceremony performed after the Sinhalese fashion. The return of Chapaṭa which may be dated to about 1181/2 A.D. and the formation of a separate school represents a very important stage in the expansion of Sinhalese Buddhism. For, with the foundation of the Sīhalasaṅgha, a centre was established at Pagan for the dissemination of this influence in Burma and to some extent in the rest of South-East Asia. The account of the formation of the Sīhalsaṅgha throws some light on the question of initiative. The establishment of Sinhalese Buddhism in Burma was not the result of missionary activities undertaken by Sinhalese monks. The initiative came mainly from the Burmese.

(cont.) was ruling at Jayavaḍḍhanapura. This king is probably Parakkamabāhu VI who ruled from Kōṭṭe. The author has to be identified, as Buddhadatta rightly pointed out with the second Chapaṭa. Theravādī Bauddhācāryayo pp. 163-9; Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. II pp.468, 331-3; UCR Vol. IX p.69.

[1] Indian Antiquary Vol. XXII p.30.

[2] Cv., 78.28-30.

The friendship between the ruling houses of Burma and Ceylon was strengthened at the end of the twelfth century when Vijayabāhu II (1186-1187) the successor of Parakkamabāhu I, wrote a letter in Pāli to the king of Arimaddanapura and signed a treaty of friendship.[1] Nissaṅka Malla, too, claims to have maintained friendly relations with Aramaṇa.[2] An inscription dated in 1197 A.D. found at the Dhammayazika shrine records the enshrinement of four sacred relics sent by the king of Ceylon.[3] Probably, it was Nissaṅka Malla who sent the relics; the Burmese king has been identified with Narapatisithu.[4] The establishment of the Sīhalasaṅgha in Burma and the prevalence of friendly relations between the two kingdoms would have promoted regular movements of monks the evidence for which, however, is unfortunately lacking.

It is noteworthy that the monk Tāmalinda who accompanied Chapaṭa to Pagan is described as a son of the king of Kāmboja (Kāmbojarājatanuja).[5] A minor dynasty called the Kāmbojas ruled from Priyaṅgu in Bengal for some time in the tenth and eleventh centuries,[6] but it seems more likely that the Kāmboja in question is the kingdom of Cambodia. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, the king of Rāmaññā seized a princess that Parakkamabāhu I sent to Kāmboja. He is also said to have apprehended and imprisoned some Sinhalese

[1] Cv., 80.6-7.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.151 l.C3.

[3] Inscriptions of Burma, List No. 19b.

[4] Than Tun, op.cit., p.268.

[5] See p. 404

[6] R. C. Majumdar, The history of Bengal Vol. I. p.32.

envoys on the charge that they were taking a letter to the king of Kāmboja.[1] Kāmboja occurs together with Aramaṇa in the inscriptions of Niśśaṅka Malla.[2] The Kāmboja in these sources could hardly be any other than the Cambodian kingdom. As the correct name of the kingdom is, however, Kambuja, it has to be assumed that this has been changed to Kāmboja, a more familiar name to the Buddhists in Ceylon.

Certain circumstantial evidences point to the existence of relations with Cambodia for some time before the reign of Parakkamabāhu I. Boisselier speaks of a Cambodian Buddha image, at present in the Musée Blanchard de la Brosse, which bears some similarity in its characteristics to examples in Ceylon. It has been assigned to a period earlier than the ninth century. However, he was rather hesitant to conclude on the derivation of early Cambodian art from Ceylon because of the differences the sculpture of the two regions reveal in the treatment of the face and the hair.[3] Dupont has pointed out the similarity of some images of 'the Buddha seated on the coils of a nāga' found in Khmer art to images from Ceylon. They have been assigned to the tenth century. As Dupont suggested, they probably represent the influence of Sinhalese art which spread into the Cambodian kingdom through the mediation of the Mons.[4] The indirect nature of this influence may to some extent explain the differences pointed out by Boisselier.

---

[1] Cv., 76.21-23, 85.

[2] EZ., Vol. II p.151 l.C3; p.155 l.14.

[3] J. Boisselier, La statuaire Khmère et son evolution, Publication de l'ÉFEO, 1955, pp. 273-4.

[4] Dupont, op.cit. p.263.

On the other hand, certain ruins from Polonnaruva which are unique in the traditions of Sinhalese architecture seem to show that the influences of the Cambodian lands were at work in Ceylon. Bell has remarked that the so-called Potgul vehera of Polonnaruva, built in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, is in many respects comparable to the Hindu temple of Mi Baume.[1] The central shrine of the Potgul vehara is a rotunda with a vestibule attached to its eastern side. It is situated in a quadrangle at the four sides of which are four stūpas each of which is 18 ft. in diameter. The whole quadrangle is enclosed by a wall. Below this is another terrace with four parivenas on the north and four on the south. The number of terraces and walls, the deployment of the shrines on the top terrace and the arrangement of the parivenas on the second are all reminiscent of the layout of the temple of Mi Baume. There are some differences as well. The layout of the terraces is not as regular as at Mi Baume. On the second terrace, the Potgulvehera has only eight parivenas as against the sixteen of Mi Baume. The gateways of Mi Baume have given place to simpler entrances at Polonnaruva. But the basic similarity of the two shrines suggests that the Potgulvehera, even if it was not modelled on the temple of Mi Baume, goes back at least to an antecedent common to both.

Another structure which stands isolated in the architectural traditions of Ceylon is the monument from Polonnaruva known as the Satmahal Prāsāda. It is a tower of seven stories the preserved portion of which

---

[1] ARASC 1906 p.17 and plates. See also A. Tissandier, Cambodge-Java p.44.

which rises to a height of slightly less than 53 ft. on a base measuring 39 ft. 2 ins. each way. Bell considered the possibility of Khmer influence.[1] Jully pointed out the similarities with the Prasat Andet in Cambodia.[2] But Dupont seems to be more accurate in his comment that analogies have to be traced in the Mon lands rather than in Cambodia proper; he has shown that the Satmahal Prāsāda comes very close to the examples at Wat P'ra Prot'on in North Siam.[3] Coedès has compared it with San Mahapon at Lamphun.[4] One difficulty in utilizing this evidence is that no direct information is available on the date of the Satmahal Prāsāda. But it is probable that it dates from the Polonnaruva period as it is found among a group of ruins dating from the reign of Vijayabāhu I to the reign of Niśśaṅka Malla.

The evidence cited above clearly points to the prevalence of relations between Ceylon and the Cambodian kingdom, particularly with the Mon regions which came under Cambodian rule. Hence it is not difficult to believe that a prince of the Khmer ruling family came to Ceylon to study Buddhism at the monastic centres of Polonnaruva. Coedès has identified the father of Tāmalinda with Jayavarman VII (c.1181-1218).[5] But if the date for the return of Chapaṭa suggested above is accepted, he should more probably be an earlier

---

[1] ARASC 1903 p.16.

[2] A. Jully, Bulletin Trimestriel de l'academie Malagache, 1903 Vol. II pp.77,8 quoted by Bell. See f.n.1.

[3] Dupont, op.cit., pp. 95-6,98.

[4] Coedès, BEFEO Vol. XXV, p.83 n.2.

[5] Coedès, Les états hindouisés... p.323.

king. The Khmer stele from Sāl Sūñ, edited by Coedès, testifies to the presence at Lavo (Lopburi) of Buddhist monks belonging to the 'Mahāyāna and the Sthavira divisions' in 1025 A.D., in the reign of Sūryavarman I.[1] The presence in Ceylon of Tāmalinda may be cited as evidence of the relations which prevailed between the Theravādins of the Cambodian and the Sinhalese kingdoms. But, unlike in the case of Burma, there is no evidence to show that Theravāda gained popularity in the Khmer kingdom during the period under review.

The Kalyāṇī inscriptions relate an interesting anecdote about Rāhula, the only Sinhalese monk in the entourage of Chapaṭa. Rāhula, it seems, fell in love with a Burmese danseuse and decided to leave the Order. Chapaṭa and the other monks who failed to persuade him to change his mind prevailed upon him to leave Burma before giving up the robes. He left for Kusīma (Bassein) from where he took ship to the island of Malaya. There he taught the Vinaya to the king of Malaya and with the bowl of precious stones that the king gave him set up house as a layman.[2] The romantic element in the story casts some doubts on its reliability. But it is not very likely that the chroniclers would have made up a story which does no credit to one of the leading figures associated with the establishment of the Sīhalasaṅgha in Burma. Probably, it has a historical basis. Malaya may be identified with Malayu in the Jambi region of Sumatra. An inscription on a Buddha image

---

[1] Coedès, Recueil des inscriptions du Siam II, pp.10-12.

[2] Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXII p.30.

found from the Vat Hva Vian at Caiya and dated in 1183 A.D.(?) records that this image was erected on the orders of a king identified as a ruler of Malayu.[1] It is evident from this that Buddhism was patronised by the king at Malayu who ruled during this period. Hence it is possible to accept that Rāhula was welcomed in this kingdom; the results of his visits, however, could not have been very impressive.

There is more independent evidence which shows that the Sinhalese schools of Buddhism were known in this area. Three groups of nuns and a group of monks went to China in the fifth century. Such movements persisted at least till the eighth century. Pou k'ong, a Ceylonese monk wielded great influence at the Chinese court during the reigns of the T'ang emperors Sou-tsong and Tai-tsong. It was he who requested the emperor in 764 A.D. to waive the imposts levied on the monasteries.[2] The sea-route to China which these religieux took lay past the ports of Java which had become an important centre in the trade between China and the Bay of Bengal.[3] It is quite reasonable to suppose that the Sinhalese saṅgha maintained contact with these countries, too. More definite evidence on this question is found in a Pre-Nāgari inscription from the Ratubaka plateau in Central Java. This inscription, dated in 792/3 A.D., records the foundation of a monastery. De Casparis who edited this inscription translated the relevant

---

[1] Coedès, Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, II, pp. 25-28.

[2] Pou Kong piao tche k.1 p.831 quoted by Jacques Gernet, Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme p.43.

passage as follows: 'This Abhayagiri Vihāra here of the Sinhalese ascetics(?), trained in the sayings of discipline of the Best of the Jinas, was established! Evidently this points to the foundation in Java of an institution named after the Abhayagiri monastery of Ceylon.[1] It is clear from this record that the Abhayagiri monastery was known and probably held in high regard in Java. It may also be suggested that there were close relations between the Abhayagiri monastery and the Javanese centres of Buddhism of this period though this does not necessarily follow from the evidence in the inscription.

The foregoing discussion reveals that the Sinhalese saṅgha maintained extensive contacts with centres of Buddhism in both South and South East Asia. The two way movement of monks between these centres and Ceylon introduced new elements of Buddhist thought into a land dominated by the Theravāda school. One of the most important developments in the history of Buddhism during this period was the wave of Mahāyāna and Tāntric influence which spread from the centres of Buddhist learning in Eastern India to the lands in South East Asia. This, as is evident from the discussion, touched the shores of Ceylon too. The evidence we have cited runs counter to the view held by certain scholars that the Abhayagiri monastery was purely national in its scope.[2] As a school which welcomed and was receptive to new thought it is to be expected that it would be extra-national in outlook. It is clear that it was not only maintained close contact with centres of Buddhist learning

---

[1] Art. As. Vol. XXIV pp. 241-248.

[2] See Paranavitana, UHC Vol. I Pt. II p.568.

in India but also inspired Buddhists in South East Asian countries like Java as early as in the eighth century.

On the other hand, the influence of the Mahāvihāra made headway in South India and later in Burma. Most of the Pali works attributed to South Indian scholars are expositions of the teachings of the Mahāvihāra. Even those writers like Kassapa who were critical of the views of their contemporaries in Ceylon claimed to adhere to the traditions of the Mahāvihāra school.[1] In fact, it was their complaint that the Sinhalese monks had veered off these traditions due to the corrupting influence of the Abhayagiri school.[2] In Burma, Sinhalese Buddhism found more fertile ground. The period under discussion represents the initial stage of its expansion into this country and the other regions of South East Asia.

This discussion has been mainly confined to movements of monks by the restrictions imposed by the availability of evidence. Undoubtedly, movements of laymen were also an important medium for the spread of ideas. The bringing of the dhammadhātu by a Sinhalese merchant who went to the Kāsi region in the sixth century was an important event in the introduction of Mahāyāna teachings to Ceylon. But, obviously, the movements of monks were the most common means of transmission of Buddhist thought from region to region.

---

[1] Mahāvihāravāsīnam kamābhatanayānugam. Mohavicchedanī p.1.

[2] Vimativ. p.99.

Chapter 8.

THE EIGHT FRATERNITIES

A development of considerable importance in the organization of the saṅgha, noticeable in the period which followed the Coḷa rule over the Island, was the rise into importance of an institution called the āyatana. The importance of this institution is reflected in the role it played in the religious as well as political affairs of the time and the deference and respect with which it was treated by the rulers and the dignitaries of the land. The Cūḷavaṃsa records that the monks of the āyatanas, together with other dignitaries of the kingdom, met on the death of Vijayabāhu I to decide on a successor to the throne. They bestowed the kingship on Jayabāhu and nominated Mānābharaṇa to the position of the uparāja.[1] The Cūḷavaṃsa also states that Parakkamabāhu I built eight three-storied mansions for the theras of the āyatanas.[2] The account in the Pūjāvaliya differs in details. It was at Sāgiri in Polonnaruva that the king built the mansions for the eight āyatanas; he endowed them with 'valuable allotments from the fields of Polonnaruva'.[3] Parakkamabāhu II restored to the eight āyatanas the lands and villages which had lapsed from their control.[4] Both the Cūḷavaṃsa and

---

[1] See Cv., 61.1-4.

[2] tattha āyatanavāsinaṃ therānaṃ thirasīlinaṃ
mahagghe aṭṭhapasāde karāpesi tibhumake - Cv., 78.33.

[3] Polonnaruvē sāgiriyē aṭa āyatanaṭa mahapā karavā... aṭa āyatanaṭa Polonnaru verupetin vaṭana pasa lava Pjv., pp. 105-106.

[4] Cv., 84.4.

the Pūjāvaliya add that he also built monasteries for the eight mahātheras of the eight āyatanas, in the outskirts of his capital.[1] The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya[2] refers to Ādipāda Vīrabāhu who wielded de-facto authority over the kingdom during the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V (1372-1408 A.D.), as having appointed various monks to the leadership of the aytāns.

The term āyatana was translated by Geiger in the first two instances of its incidence in the Cūlavaṃsa as 'district' and as 'sanctuary' in the third.[3] Āyatana has also been used to denote 'monastery' in certain instances.[4] But the contexts of the passages cited above suggest that the term is being used in these cases in a specific and technical sense. The Cūlavaṃsa also refers to the monks of eight establishments called mūlavihāras as having left Polonnaruva in protest against the confiscation of monastic property by Vikkamabāhu I (1111-1132 A.D.).[5] Geiger translated mūlavihāra as 'original monasteries'. The similarity of the numbers involved may suggest that both these terms, āyatana and mūlavihara, refer to the same type of institution. But it is not evident from our sources that these terms were used to describe any one of the ancient monasteries like the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri.

In this connection, it is interesting that the Cūlavaṃsa refers in its description of the meritorious deeds of Yasodharā, the daughter of

---

[1] Cv., 84.18; Pjv., p.118.

[2] Niks. (Vikramasiṃha Ed.) p.30.

[3] Cv. trsl. Vol. I p.225; Vol. II pp.105, 154, 155.

[4] See p.455.

[5] Cv., 61.58-61.

Vijayabāhu I, to the patronage she extended to the Kappūramūlāyatana.[1] Similarly, the Daḷadāsirita speaks of the monks of the Uturuḷa-muḷu-ayatän in connection with the rituals pertaining to the Tooth relic.[2] These two examples are important as they demonstrate that the terms mūla and āyatana were used conjointly to refer to the same institution. Secondly, there is little doubt that these two institutions are identical with the two fraternities, Kapārā and Uttaromūla (var. Uttaraḷha, Uturaḷu, Uturuḷu, Uturu) of the Abhayagiri nikāya. In the Sinhalese inscriptions of the tenth century, these two institutions were known by the term muḷa. The term muḷa meant 'group' or 'collection' and is used in this sense in the contemporary literary work, the Dhampiyā Atuvā Gätapadaya.[3] The Pali term mūla which occurs in the chronicles is used in the same sense but seems to be, as Paranavitana has suggested,[4] an incorrect rendering of the Sinhalese term. Thus it seems quite probable that the terms muḷa, mūla, mūlavihāra, ayatän, āyatana, muḷu-ayatän and mūlāyatana were all similar in meaning and connoted a 'fraternity of monks'. The word samūha has also been used in this special sense in certain instances.[5]

It is evident from the references cited above that these were eight 'fraternities' within the body of the saṅgha, each led, presumably, by a

---

[1] Cv., 60.83.

[2] Daḷadāsirita pp.49-54.

[3] DAG. p.59.

[4] EZ Vol. V Pt. 1 p.168.

[5] See pp.442.

mahāthera. Apart from being organizations of monks, they were bodies which owned property including land and villages. Two instances are known of monasteries being built at the capitals for these eight mūlas or āyatanas. It is possible that it was these monasteries which were known by the term mūlavihāra.

The Uttaramūla was one of the most important and influential of the eight fraternities. The Cūlavaṃsa presents an account of the origin of this fraternity in its chapter on the early life of Vijayabāhu I.[1] One writer who has based his conclusions on the context of this passage has dated the foundation of the Uttaramūla to the reign of Vijayabāhu.[2] But a closer examination of the chapter reveals that the passage from the fourth strophe to the twenty-sixth which comprises the account of the origin of the Uttaramūla stands independently. There is hardly any connection between strophes 3 and 4 or 26 and 27. It is quit e possible that this account was a legend preserved at the Uttaramūla itself; it would have been inserted in the chronicle at a time when this institution had risen into importance as one of the eight major units in the organization of the saṅgha.

According to this account, prince Māna (I), son and heir to the throne of a certain king Kassapa, was blinded in one eye during the course of an incantation he performed before the God Skanda. He considered himself disqualified from kingship owing to this physical defect and requested the courtiers to crown his 'younger brother' Māna (II) in his place. Māna II was

[1] Cv., chap. 57.

[2] Encyclopaedia of Buddhism. Fascicule A - Aca p.12.

sent for and he came to Anurādhapura to be consecrated. After taking over the kingship, he took his elder brother to the Abhayagiri monastery and had him admitted to the Order. Then he built for him the Uttaromūla parivena and placed him at the head of six hundred monks. The 'seven supervisory officials' (paṭihāra) and the 'five groups of servitors'[1] (pessavagga) were delegated to serve him and the guardians of the Tooth were placed under his direction. The king carried on the administration according to his counsel.

It would appear from this story that the Uttaromūla occupied a pre-eminent position in the organization of monks from the very beginning of its history. It had six hundred monks within its fold, was founded by a king and led by one who had been the heir to the throne. Moreover, it had in its charge the Tooth Relic which had come to be recognized as one of the most valuable possessions in the kingdom. It is evident from the Velaikkāra inscription at Polonnaruva,[2] that the Tooth relic had come to be in the charge of this fraternity at least by the time of Vijayabāhu I. But one tends to doubt the authenticity of a story which points to its occupying such a high position from the time of its foundation. It would be natural to suspect such a story as a later development.

In fact, certain contradictory elements come to light when an attempt is made to date the foundation of the Uttaromūla on the basis of the story.

---

[1] For a discussion on these terms see pp.153, 184.

[2] EI. Vol. XVIII pp.330-340; EZ Vol. II pp.242-55.

At the end of the story, Māna (II), the founder, is referred to as Mānavamma who founded a dynasty of sixteen rulers with Aggabodhi at its head. The reference to succession by a ruler called Aggabodhi strengthens the possibility that the king in question was Mānavamma who captured the throne with troops from the Kāvaṭṭi (Pallava) country. This seems to be further confirmed by the Pūjāvaliya which ascribes the foundation of the Uturaḷamula to Mahalāpāna, son of Pāṣuḷu Kasubu, who defeated Hunannaru Riyandaḷa with troops from the Kāvaṭṭi country.[1]

It may seem that the corroborative evidence from all these works point to the foundation of this institution by Mānavamma (684-718). But certain other facts in the story strike a discordant note. According to the legend, it was an heir-apparent by the name Māna, son of king Kassapa, who had the throne bestowed upon his kinsman who shared his name. Obviously, the accession of Mānavamma does not conform to this description. However, there is another instance from the history of the Island, which seems to agree, though not completely, with these details. According to the 45th chapter of the Cūlavaṃsa, the heir to the throne of Kassapa II (650-659) was his son Mānaka. But, as he was too young, the king summoned his nephew Māna from Rohaṇa and gave him the charge of the government as well as the welfare of his children. Here it is seen that Māna was a cousin of Mānaka; according to the terms of kinship prevalent among the Sinhalese a cousin is called brother. A comparison of the two accounts suggests that it was not king

---

[1] Pjv., p.102.

Mānavamma but Māna that the earlier part of the legend speaks of. But there is a discrepancy between the two stories in that in chapter 45, Māna does not become king but crowns his father as Dappula I, while in the other Māna (II) is consecrated king. In this connection it may be pointed out that even in the Pūjāvaliya and the Daḷadāsirita,[1] the founder of the Uttaramūla is described as āpāno (= P. ādipāda) and not as king though he is said to have brought troops from the Kāvaṭṭi country. Āpāno would be a title more appropriate for Māna than for Mānavamma.

This identification is of considerable value in testing the credit-worthiness of the legend. Firstly, it is mentioned in the account in chapter 45 of the Cūḷavaṃsa that Māna was invited to take over the government as Mānaka was too young. This confirms our suspicions and gives us sufficient evidence to rule out completely the miraculous and dramatic part of the legend which presents Māna (I) as a person disqualified from kingship due to the loss of an eye. The second important fact about the account is that it was Mānaka who later became king as Mānavamma. Hence we may be fairly certain that the latter part of the legend, which claims that the heir-apparent Māna joined the Order and became the first chief incumbent of the Uttaramūla, is also a later development which does not stand to critical scrutiny. Finally, according to this legend, there were about sixteen kings in the dynasty founded by Mānavamma. But it is clear from the Cūḷavaṃsa itself that there were more than sixteen rulers in this dynasty

[1] Pjv., p.102; Daḷadāsirita, p.42.

This may point, though not necessarily, to the origin or the writing down of this legend in or not long after the sixteenth king's reign, that is in the reign of Kassapa V or soon afterwards.

An examination of the evidence in the chronicles on the foundation of the Uttaromūla shows that there was some amount of confusion on the identity of the founder. This is understandable as the two claimants to this honour were not only contemporaries but also cousins who shared the same name. This difficulty, however, is not liable to cause a radical alteration in the chronological position of the origin of this institutinn as Mānavamma became king only about twenty-five years after Māna assumed power.

The problem has become more involved by the appearance of a third person who staked a claim in a most unobtrusive yet romantic manner by scribbling two verses on the Mirror Wall at Sīgiri to express his admiration for 'the maidens of Sīgiri'. Below the two verses, he wrote of himself as, Uturoḷapirivana karayu le Riyandaḷmi. Translated into English this would read, 'I am Riyandaḷ (P. Ratanadāṭha or Hatthadāṭha), the Scribe, who founded the Uturoḷa-pirivana'.[1] Uturoḷa being a rather unusual name, it is probable that it refers to the Uturoḷpirivana of the Abhayagiri monastery. If so, this record would cast grave doubts on the reliability of the evidence from the chronicles.

Paranavitana has commented that the graffito may be 'taken as dating back to the period of Mānavamma', and suggested that the chronicles of a

---

[1] Sīgiri Graffiti, Vol. II p.285 v.463.

later period have credited the king with the work of one of his subjects.[1] This would, of course, be one means of reconciling the discrepancies in our sources. But, Paranavitana himself has dated the graffito on palaeographic grounds to the second half of the eighth century.[2] Hence, inspite of the evidence of the chronicles, we cannot rule out the possibility of the Uttarola-pirivana having been founded as late as in this period.

The earliest direct reference to this institution occurs in the account of the reign of Sena I (833-853) in the Cūlavamsa. Sena I built a residence for monks (parikcheda), named after himself, at the Uttarāḷha.[3] The context of the passage suggests that it was at the Abhayagiri monastery. His successor Sena II (853-857), erected a pāsāda at the same institution.[4] It is probable that the Uttaromūla moved its seat to Polonnaruva after the accession of Vijayabāhu I, who built monasteries for the three nikāyas in the new city.[5] The next reference to it occurs in the Velaikkāra inscription at Polonnaruva.[6] According to this record, Vijayabāhu I built the temple of the Tooth relic within the precincts of the Uttorulmūla, which was 'the principal āyatana of the Abhayagiri monastery, the chief fane of the city of Pulanāri'.[7] This shrine housed the Tooth and Bowl relics as well as 'the

---

[1] Sigiri Graffiti, Vol. I p.ccxi.
Vol. II

[2] Ibid./p. 285, v.463.

[3] Cv., 50.77.

[4] Cv., 51.75.

[5] Cv., 60.9-10.

[6] EI Vol. XVIII pp.330-340.

[7] Pulanāriyāha Vijayarājapurattu eduppitta mūlasthānamāgiya

(cont.)

great stone image of the Buddha'. It appears from this that the Uttaromūla and perhaps the Abhayagiri monastery itself were, by this time, established at Polonnaruva. Further, this record establishes beyond doubt that the Uttaromūla was a fraternity attached to the Abhayagiri nikāya.

It is noteworthy that this inscription was found near the so-called vihāre no. 2 at the 'Quadrangle to the north of the Citadel' in Polonnaruva.[1] This brick-built shrine comprising a vestibule and a garbhagṛha occupies a space of roughly 75 by 45 feet. The garbhagṛha has thirty-six stone columns distributed in the pattern familiar at Anurādhapura, with twenty of them standing flush with the walls and leaving wide intercolumniation in the middle, either way, in cross-like fashion. Paranavitana[2] points out that stylistically it stands midway between the Anurādhapura period and the age of Parakkamabāhu I. Mason-marks on the building had the word daḷadā. It seems to have also served as an image-house for it has three images at the back of the garbhagṛha, placed against 'curtain walls'. On the left is a flight of stairs which led to an upper floor built possibly of timber. Perhaps, the relics were kept there. All this conforms to the description of the shrine in the inscription. Hence, it may be said that the site of the 'Quadrangle to the north of the Citadel' belonged to the Uttaromūla. The Quadrangle was, however, within the city. And it is unlikely that

---

(cont.) Abhayagiri-mahāvihārattu agrāyatanamāṇa Uttoruḷmūlaiyil. EI Vol. XVIII p.337 ll.17-19.

[1] ARASC 1903 pp.8-11.

[2] CJSG Vol. II p.163.

the monastic establishment of the Uttaromūla was within the city. We may postulate that the Tooth relic was housed within the city and placed under the charge of the Uttaromūla.

It is evident from this record that, by the end of the reign of Vijayabāhu I, the Uttaromūla had become important enough to call itself the chief āyatana of the Abhayagiri-vihāra and that it had been vested with the charge of the Bowl and Tooth relics which were important in the religious as well as the political life of the country. This association with the two relics would have considerably enhanced the position of this institution in the eyes of the faithful. We also learn from the record that the mahāsthavira of the mūla at the time was Magalan who was described as a man of good conduct and behaviour, versed in the śāstras and the āgamas, in addition to being the royal preceptor (rājaguru).[1] The legend on the origin of the Uttaromūla strongly suggests that this monastery had become a large institution supporting a multitude of monks and wielding considerable influence in both religious and political life, at least by the time of the origin of the legend. By the end of the reign of Vijayabāhu I, this description had become a reality.

It has already been mentioned that the monks of the eight mūlavihāras left for Rohaṇa in the reign of Vikkamabāhu I in protest against his 'misdeeds'. We can be fairly certain that the monks of the Uttaromūla were among

---

[1] He also has the title vyākarini. Wickremasinghe interpreted this as 'grammarian'. But this interpretation is not reliable.

them as it is mentioned that the Tooth and Bowl relics were also taken to Rohaṇa.[1] These relics were in Rohaṇa till they were captured and brought back to Polunnaruva in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.[2] Most probably the monks of the Uttaramūla followed the relics.

More information on this fraternity is available in a literary work written in the time of Parakkamabāhu IV (1303-1326). The Daḷadāsirita,[3] which gives the history of the Tooth relic and lays down the procedure to be followed in the rituals pertaining to it, states that the casket containing the relic was to be removed from its shrine by the chief incumbent of the Uturuḷumuḷu-ayatän, with the assistance of suitable people selected from the two clans - Gaṇaväsi and Kiliṃ - when it had to be taken in procession. After the procession, the seals of the casket were broken in the presence of this dignitary and an exposition of the relics was held for the benefit of the saṅgha, the king and the public. All disputes concerning the temple of the Tooth relic were to be settled by the chief incumbent of the Uturuḷumuḷu-ayatän sitting in session with the king's ministers. Thus it is clear that the Uttaramūla enjoyed the custodianship of the Tooth relic even as late as the fourteenth century. It had accompanied the Tooth relic in its wanderings with the change of capitals and was settled at this time at Kurunägalpura.

Perhaps, this association with the Relic helped its survival. Mention of this fraternity occurs as late as in the fifteenth century, in the

[1] Cv., 61.61.

[2] Cv., 74.-67-68.

[3] Daḷadāsirita, pp. 49-54.

literary works of the hierarch Rāhula who lived at the Vijayabāhu Pirivana in Toṭagamuva, in South Ceylon. In the Kāvyaśekhara, one of his verse works, he refers to himself as the grandson, in pupillary succession, of the mahāthera Rāhula of the Uturumula.[1] Unfortunately, little definite information is available on Rāhula, the elder.[2] In the Padasādhanaṭīkā,[3] Rāhula of Toṭagamuva, claims to be the grandson of Rāhula of the Uturumula and at the same time traces back the pupillary succession to Sāriputta of Polonnaruva. This is significant as it seems to suggest that the later members of the Uttaramūla laid little emphasis on the origin of this fraternity in the Abhayagiri nikāya and that the differences, with regard to teachings, which marked it out from other fraternities, had more or less disappeared by this time. Another statement of particular interest occurs in the Parevisandesaya[4] of the same author. Here, he claims to have obtained a boon at the age of fifteen from the god Kanda (Skanda). This reminds one of the legend about the founder of the fraternity who was also described as a devotee of the same god. It is extremely difficult to determine the true significance of these two statements though they seem to suggest that the Uttaramūla was associated, in some way or other, with the cult of Skanda. The Uttaramūla seems to have produced yet another poet in the author of the Anuraddhaśataka who describes himself as the 'upasthavira

---

[1] Kāvy. Sarga I v.23.

[2] Buddhadatta confounds him with Galaturumula mahāsvāmi of the Tīrthagāma vihāra. He believes that the term Uturumula was derived from Galaturumula. But there is no evidence to warrant such an identification. For Galaturumula see p.

[3] Sariputtamahādisāmijanane jātassa sambhāvite-nattā uttara mūlarāhulamahātherassa sikkhāgarū, Padasadhanaṭīkā quoted in Theravādi Bauddhācāryayo p.156

(cont.)

Anuruddha who was like unto a jewel in the necklace of the Uttaromūla'.[1] This work testifies to a rather high standard of Sanskrit versification but fails to provide any definite evidence to help us determine its date.[2]

Equal in importance to the Uttaromūla was the Kapārāmuḷa or the Kappurāmūla, a fraternity which finds frequent mention in the inscriptions of the Abhayagiri monastery. According to the Cūlavaṃsa,[3] Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667) built the Kappūra-parivena at the Abhayagiri monastery; but evidence in the Sinhalese chronicles casts doubts on the validity of this statement. The Pūjāvaliya and the Sulurājāvaliya ascribe the building of the Mahā (Greater) Kapārā Pirivana and the Kuḍā (Lesser) Kapārā Pirivana to Kassapa IV (898-914).[4] However, these seem to represent a confusion rather than evidence contradicting the testimony of the Cūlavaṃsa. For, these two works attribute, at the same time, the construction of the Kapārā pirivana to Lamani Daḷupatis (Dāṭhopatissa II). Further, in the Cūlavaṃsa mention of the Kapārā Pirivana occurs twice prior to the reign of Kassapa IV, i.e. in the reigns of the fourth (667-683) and the ninth

---

4(cont.)
Kaṅdavuru kula upan rāṅdi toṭagamu piyasa - seda dat siyaḷu kav naḷu magada saku basa - kaṅda kumariṅdu vara lad pasaḷos vayasa - vadahaḷa rahal vädi tän kala räv saṅdesa. Kaṅdavurakula, if taken as derived from Skanda-varakula, would mean 'the clan which received a boon from Skanda'. But kaṅdavura also means 'military camp'. Parevi sandeśaya v.208.

1Idam vyadhattottaramūlahāra-ratnāṅkuropasthaviranuruddhaḥ Anuruddhaśataka v.101.

2Some scholars have dated the poem to the Polonnaruva period on stylistic grounds. Ceylon Historical Journal Vol. IV p.96; UHC Vol. I pt. II p.589.

3Cv., 45.29.

4Pjv., p.103; Sulurājāvaliya p.10.

(831-833) kings who bore the name Aggabodhi.[1] In the light of the fact that Aggabodhi IV was the immediate successor of Dāṭhopatissa II, the testimony of the Cūlavaṃsa appears to be creditworthy.

Apparently, the Kapārā Pirivana attracted the indulgence of a greater number of patrons than the Uttaromūla. Potthakuṭṭha, a Tamil officer in the service of Aggabodhi II, erected a pāsāda at the Kappūra Parivana and granted a village to it.[2] In the reign of Aggabodhi IX, Sena, the mahādipāda, built a row of cells (? pariccheda) which bore his own name, for the same institution.[3] As mentioned earlier, Kassapa IV built the Kuḍā Kapārā Pirivana so that there were two institutions called Mahā Kapārā and Kuḍā Kapārā within the Kapārā fraternity.[4] Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) claims that he built the Salameyvanpavu for the Kapārā-muḷa, in an inscription, dated to his sixth regnal year (919), found in the 'stone-canopy area' of the Abhayagiri monastery.[5] There is hardly any doubt that Salameyvanpavu was the same as Silāmeghapabbata, mentioned in the Culavaṃsa, which he built at the Abhayagiri and endowed with a grant of villages. The same inscription decrees that an amuṇa of rice and four aka of gold should be set apart daily for the provision of alms to the inmates of the

[1] Cv., 46.21; 50.77.

[2] Cv., 46.21-2.

[3] Cv., 50.77.

[4] Pjv., p.103.

[5] EZ., Vol. I p.47 l.13.

Mahā Kapāra Pirivana. Further, one thousand (kalanḍ?) of gold were set apart each year for the provisinn of robes.[1] It was mentioned earlier that the Mahā Kapāra Pirivana was one of the two major groups within the Kapārā fraternity; and these figures would enable one to hazard an estimate of the number of its inmates at the time as having been slightly over three hundred.[2]

Mention of the Kapārā-mula occurs also in a Sanskrit inscription found from within the precincts of the Abhayagiri monastery and dated by Paranavitana to 995 A.D., three years after Rājaraṭṭha passed under Cola rule.[3] According to this record, Saṅghanandin, who calls himself sthavira-munivara and was most probably an eccleciastical hierarch in the fraternity gave 200 ṭaṅkās[4] to provide 'drinkables' (pānīya) for the monks at the Kapārārāma. This inscription is significant as it purports to be within the precincts of the Kapārārāma, and thereby helps to locate the site of the fraternity. It was discovered at the site of a monastery in the north-west of the Kuṭṭam Pokuṇa in Section V of the Abhayagiri area. Paranavitana believes that it was found at or near the original site.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.48-50.

[2] An amuṇa would amount to 40 lāhas or 160 'measures' (sēru) of rice. On a conservative estimate, this should be sufficient to provide 640 meals. Considering the fact that two meals were served every day this would point to a rough estimate of the population of monks to 300. It has also been pointed out that the provision of robes was expected to cost about 3 kalanḍ of gold per monk, each year. The fact that one thousand (kalanḍ?) were set apart would suggest the presence of a similar number. See p.210.

[3] EZ Vol. V pt. I pp. 162-169.

[4] The ṭaṅkā, as it is known today in India, is subject to a great degree of regional variation (about 43 to 72 grains). For a discussion, see H. W. Codrington, Ceylon coins.... p.5.

The main ruin[1] found at the site today is a pañcāyatana group surrounded by cloisters except on the east. And on the east was a stairway leading to a stylobate 63 ft. square, with projecting bays. Access to it could be gained from the north, west and the south. 'This stylobate formed an open colonnade round the central walled shrine, which conformed generally to the basement plan and entrances, but in fret lines. Within, the four free-standing pillars were of the spreading-capital type. At the back was a small projection, perhaps once a portico on the east. No other ruin has yet come to light at Anurādhapura approaching this unique building in beauty of outline and choice ornamentation of some of its columns.'[2] There is no evidence to exactly determine the function of this remarkable structure. The debris scattered round these ruins point to the possible existence of other buildings. But the ravages of nature and of vandals have removed all clues about their form and function. The whole complex of ruins was situated within a walled enclosure and a well-laid out pathway which passed through a stone-built gate-house connected them with the rest of the monastery. But in all probability, this group of buildings was only part of the Kapārārāma and should not be mistaken for the whole.

Bell who excavated the site of a ruined monastery at Puliyankulam, about two miles to the east of the Abhayagiri monastery, declared that it was 'the largest and most complete monastery of its kind discovered at

---

[1] ARASC 1894 p.3. See also plate XIII of the Thirteenth Report of the ASC.

[2] ARASC 1894 p.3.

Anurādhapura.[1] The central feature of this monastic complex was a square terrace supporting four shrines. The terrace was surrounded by thirty two cells, each measuring 26 ft. square and supported by twelve pillars, laid out in perfect symmetry. Round these was a wide moat, while the outermost boundary was marked by a wall of a double-line of stones about six to seven feet in width and forming a rectangle measuring 330 by 360 yards. Access to the central terrace was open from all the four sides, but the mainentrance was on the south. A connecting street twenty five feet wide extended from the gate-house on the south and widened to ninety feet at about thirty-five yards from the terrace. The symmetry of the whole layout is reminiscent of the so-called Vijayārāma.[2]

A path, which extended directly to the north of the terrace over the moat and part of the stone-wall, connected this monastic complex with an image-house, situated on a succession of terraces, which was described by Bell as the best specimen of its kind. The lowest of the terraces was 130 ft. long, 100 ft. wide and 4ft. 3 ins. high. It had two flights of stairs on the south and the east. The second terrace measured 100 ft. by 78 ft. and was 3 ft. 2 ins. high and had an entrance only on the south. On this was a large shrine comprising sanctum and a vestibule similar in proportions to the image-house at the Jetavana monastery.[3] Access to the vestibule could

---

[1] ARASC 1896 p.3; 1897 pp.4-6; 1898 pp.3-4.

[2] ASC Fourth Progress Report pp.2-3; Sixth Progress Report pp.5-6.

[3] See pp.34-35.

be gained from both the south and the east.

Immediately around the image-house were four structures built of brick and mortar on stone plinths. Their floors were covered with lime concrete. Their layout suggests that they possibly had an upper floor. Two of themhave been identified by Bell as 'gate-houses' and the other two as residential quarters. To the north of the image-house was a building of thirty columns, slightly detached from the rest, and a ruin identified as a 'bath-house' was found to the south-east. Bell has remarked that this group appears to be of a later date than the buildings at the moated site.

Two inscriptions dated to the reign of a certain Abhā Salamevan were found at the monastery at the moated site.[1] But it is a record found at the image-house to its north that is most relevant to ourpurpose.[2] This inscription dated to the twelfth regnal year of Dappula IV (924-935 A.D.) identifies the site as the Udākitagbopavu, the hermitage built by Udā mahayā (mahādipāda Udaya) and named after him and his son, Kitagbo āpā (Ādipāda Kittaggabodhi). It was generously endowed for the provision of priestly requisities and granted to twelve monks described as 'adorned with ornaments of distinctive virtues such as moderation in desires, contentment and religious austerity', who came from the Kapārāmula vä vāṭena Puvaram-vehera.[3] The term vä has been used in both the Sīgiri Graffiti and the

[1] ARASC 1898 p.4.

[2] EZ Vol. I p.182.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.186 ll.13-18.

Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya[1] in the sense of 'having originated', and vāṭena from Skt. √vṛt occurs with the meaning 'being' and 'existing'.[2] On this basis, it seems possible to trace the origins of the community of monks at the Puvaram (P. Pubbārāma) monastery to the Kapārā fraternity of the Abhayagiri nikāya. And as the Udākitagbopavu was granted to monks from the Puvaram monastery it is probable that both these institutions accepted the leadership of the Kapārā fraternity.

It is rather unlikely that the extensive monastery at the moated site with about thirty-two buildings devoted to residential purposes is identical with the hermitage built by mahādipāda Udaya for twelve monks. Hence it seems reasonable to identify the site of this inscription with its ruins of moderate proportions as the Udākitagbopavu. But this raises the problem of the identity of the moated site. The archaeological evidence cited earlier provides us with some indeterminate yet helpful clues. It is evident that a very close relationship prevailed between the monastery of the moated site and the hermitage to its north. An examination of the building techniques reveals that the moated site was built earlier than the other complex. Lastly, the whole group was situated to the east of the city and the Abhayagiri monastery.

It has already been mentioned that the twelve monks who occupied this hermitage came from the Puvaramvehera. Further, the inscriptions states

---

[1] Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II pp. 10-11 v.18, pp. 33-34 v.55.

[2] ŚSŚ Vol. II p.887. See also Dharmapradīpikā (Dharmārāma) p.323.

that whenever the number of residents at the hermitage fell short of the specified figure, the vacancies were to be filled with monks from the same monastery. It also lays down that no objections were to be raised if any of the monks decides to go and live at the main monastery.[1] According to the Cūlavaṃsa the Pubbārāma was built about a century earlier than the Udākiraggabopavu, by Sena I (833-853) and his queen Saṃghā, who also made endowments for the provision of the requisites of the saṅgha.[2] Finally, it may be pointed out that the name Pubbārāma, though it does not necessarily imply that it was on the east, strongly suggests that it was so. Hence it may be suggested that it is the Pubbārāma which is represented today by the moated site at Puḷiyankulam. If this is so, it can be asserted with greater confidence that both the monastic groups at Puliyankalam came under the leadership of the Kapārā fraternity of the Abhayagiri nikāya.

The Kapārā-muḷa occurs for the last time in the Cūlavaṃsa in the account of the reign of Vijayabāhu I. Yasodharā, the king's daughter built a large image-house for the Kappūramūlāyatana.[3] It is not clear from the chronicle whether this was at Anurādhapura or Polonnaruva though it is possible that the Kappūramūla, too, had moved to Polonnaruva during the reign of Vijayabāhu I. No later instance of the Kapārāmuḷa being referred

---

[1] Mehi unu tänakaṭ saṅgun eḷ(va)ṭ tanä saṅg-vat-himiyanaṭ saṅg sanä vatä kiyena vat himiyan veherin ganna isa meyin veherä gos visiyäṭi saṅg kenek haṭ sahak no vä ganna isa. EZ Vol. I p.187 ll.30-33. We propose to read the last portion of l.33 as ḍahak no väganna isa. Compare the letter with sa in ll.34, 37 and ḍa in l.17. The absence of the upward stroke in the centre makes it clear that the particular letter was ḍa and not sa. The word ḍahak occurs in the Dhampiyä Aṭuvä Gätapadaya (p.166) as the Sinhalese synonym for P. palibodha,'obstruction', 'hindrance', 'obstacle'. Wickremasinghe interpreted saṅgsanä as the Saṅghasenapabbatavihāra. But such an interpretation would point to the unusual implication that though

to by name is known from our sources, though the references to the eight mūlas seems to testify to its continued existence.

We have seen that the Uttaramūla and the Kapārāmūla find frequent mention as leading fraternities within the Abhayagiri nikāya. Most probably, they are identical with the 'two mulas' of the Abhayagiri nikāya which occur in the inscriptions of the tenth century. The Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) contains the regulation that the accounts pertaining to the main institutions of the Abhayagiri monastery were to be obtained from the two mulas and the six avasas and written down at the end of the year to be presented to the general assembly of monks.[1] Elsewhere, we have cited the statement from the Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV (956-972) that the accounts of the Cetiyagiri monastery at Mihintale were to be settled by the committee of management in collaboration with the representatives of the two mulas of the Abhayagiri nikāya.[2] The inscription of Kassapa V states that the accounts of the Cetiyagiri monastery were to be obtained from the chief monks of the two mulas and written down at the end of the year to be presented to the general assembly of monks.[3]

(cont.) the first batch of monks came to this hermitage from the Pubbārāma, subsequent vacancies were to be filled with monks from the Saṅghasenapabbata. Sorata's suggestion that saṅgaṇā would have meant the assembly of monks seems to be more plausible (SSS p.987).

[2] Cv., 50.69.

[3] Cv., 60.83.

---

[1] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.35-37.

[2] See p.140.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.37-38.

These two passages have been greatly misunderstood. Wickremasinghe[1] believed that the first implied that the Cetiyagiri monastery belonged to the Kapārāmūla, a conclusion unwarranted and even contradicted by the evidence. Perera was led to believe that there were two mulas at each of the two monasteries, the Abhayagiri and the Cetiyagiri.[2] It is admissible that the Abhayagiri monastery came to comprise four mulas. But, certainly there is no evidence to show that there were any such fraternities at the Cetiyagiri; the Tablets of Mahinda IV are quite clear and specific in stating that the accounts were to be settled in collaboration with the representatives of the two mulas of the Abhayagiri nikāya who had come to assist in the proceedings.[3] And hence we can be fairly certain in stating that the two mulas referred to in the Anurādhapura Slab Inscription of Kassapa V and the Mihintale Tablets of Mahinda IV were in fact the same, and in identifying them as the Uttaromūla and the Kappūramūla.

It has been pointed out earlier that certain monasteries and hermitages of the Abhayagiri nikāya based their origin to a mūla within the nikāya and, perhaps, accepted its leadership. It is further evident from the facts cited in the preceding paragraph that the two mūlas occupied a place of prime importance in the organization of the Abhayagiri nikāya. They

[1] EZ Vol. I p.81.

[2] L. S. Perera, Institutions... p.1423.

[3] Ababaygiri veherhi demulin sāhanuvat vādi saṅgun sāmāṅgiri
EZ Vol. I p.92 A.22.

seem to have been directly concerned with the internal administration of the Abhayagiri monastery and were also responsible to the community of monks of the main monastery for the supervisory control over the monasteries and hermitages belonging to the nikāya. Inscriptions testify to their joint participation in the administration of the Cetiyagiri monastery for a period of more than half a century. Most probably, it extended to a much longer period.

In this connection, a regulation occurring in the inscription of Kassapa V seems relevant. It decrees[1] that in the case of a dispute among the 'unsupported monks ' (apilisaraṇa saṅgun), 'recipients of incomes', (lābha laduvan) or 'the recipients of dwellings' (avasladuvan), the monks of the mula were to sit in session and resolve it. It is significant that no mention is made of the head of the nikāya in this respect. If the mula failed to settle the dispute an inquiry was to be held in collaboration with the royal officials and suitable punishments were to be levied. It is to be expected that it would have been very difficult to bring all the affairs of such a large monastery as the Abhayagiri under one central control. And these facts seem to suggest that it was a loosely organized corporate institution in which the mulas had great responsibility and importance.

---

[1] Apilisaraṇa vathimiyan isā lābha laduvan isā avas laduvan isā kalaha yana varada dak ātapavat mula saṅgun hindā ninmavanu isa saṅgun visin no nimat samdaruvan ha mulvā vicarakoṭ nimava pat pat seyin daṅduvam karanu isa. EZ Vol. I p.48 ll.:29-31.

An ornate eulogy in a late tenth-century inscription at the Abhayagiri monastery describes, apart from the Ratanapāsāda and the image-houses, the four mulas of the monastery which were compared to four divine abodes.[1] This is perhaps an indication that two more institutions gained prominence and grew large enough to acquire the status of mulas. The inscription of Kassapa V, as quoted earlier, refers to two mulas. Of the six avasas it names two, the Vahadū and the Mahanetpā, which were probably the most important.[2] It is these two avasas which one tends to expect, would obtain the status of mulas.

This indeed seems to be what really happened. For Vahadū is most probably identical with the Vādu-mula which, according to the Pūjāvaliya,[3] was built by Mānavamma. But, very little reliable information is available on this institution. It occurs in a graffito at Sīgiriya which mentions a thera who belonged to Vahadū.[4] According to the Cūlavamsa, Aggabodhi VI (733-722 A.D.) built a pāsāda at the Vāhadīpa monastery.[5] Udaya I (797-801) built the Senaggabodhipabbata hermitage for the Vāhadīpa.[6] Dappula II (815-831) repaired a pāsāda at the Hatthikucchivihāra, the ārāma of the Vāhadīpa and the Lāvārapabbata.[7] Div and dū are Sinhalese synonyms for the Pali term dīpa[8] and it is possible to suggest that Vahadū

[1] satara mul satara maha div kavana EZ Vol. I p.221 l.8.

[2] mahanet pā vahadū de avasaṭad me sirit karamu isā EZ Vol. I p.49 ll.47-48.

[3] Pjv., p.102; See also Daladāsirita p.42.

[4] Sīgiri Graffiti Vol. II p.137 v.224.

[5] Cv., 48.65.

[6] Cv., 49.33.

[7] Cv., 49.76.

[8] See ŚSŚ Vol. I pp. 420, 431.

and Vādu were synonyms with Vāhadīpa. But one cannot be certain about this identification as Vāhadīpa occurs in the Cūlavamsa together with the Hatthikucchivihāra which has been located in the Kurunāgala District.[1]

There is more information on the other fraternity. The Cūlavamsa records that Aggabodhi V (718-724) built the Mahānettādipādika pariccheda and gave it with the village Devatissa to the Dhammarucikas.[2] Sena I built an alms-hall on the Mahānettapabbata.[3] Assuming that Mahānettapabbata was situated in Polonnaruva, Nicholas has suggested that this fraternity was stationed in the vicinity of this city.[4] But the validity of this assumption as well as the identification of the Mahānettādipādika with the Mahānettapabbata are questionable. This fraternity is referred to as a mūla in the Pūjāvaliya which speaks of Vijayabāhu IV (1270-1273) as having built a monastery on the top of the Vātagiri rock for the mahāthera of the Mahanetpāmula.[5] This is confirmed by the Cūlavamsa in which the fraternity is referred to as the Mahānettapāsāda āyatana.[6] The Vātagiri pabbata has been identified with

---

[1] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.93.

[2] Cv., 48.2

[3] Cv., 50.74.

[4] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.34.

[5] Pjv., p.139.

[6] Cv., 88.46-47.

the present Vākirigala in the Kāgalla district.[1] It is thus clear that the headquarters of this fraternity had shifted to the south-west along with the capital of the Sinhalese kingdom and that the fraternity continued to enjoy the patronage of the royalty.

Further, the author of the Pūjāvaliya mentions that the monk who benefited from this munificence of the king, Sumaṅgala of the Mahanet-pāmuḷa, was a contemporary of his and that he had learned the dhamma from Sumaṅgala.[2] Attempts have been made to identify Sumaṅgala with the author of the Abhidhammatthavibhāviṇī who was a pupil of Sāriputta and it has been suggested on this basis that monks of the Mahāvihāra nikāya had been appointed over the Mahanetpāmuḷa after the unifications of the nikāyas.[3] But it is significant that Buddhaputra, the author of the Pūjāvaliya, mentions that Sumaṅgala was a 'brother' of his. This in eccleciastical terms would mean that they were fellow-pupils of the same teacher. The Pūjāvaliya was written in the thirty-fifth year of Parakkamabāhu II (1270 A.D.). It is not very likely that he or his contemporary should have been pupils of Sāriputta who was a senior thera in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.).

In the Vuttamālā, written in the reign of Parakkamabāhu V (1344-1359), the mahāthera of the Mahānettapāsādamūla was extolled as a teacher of renown and a monk of great virtue.[4] It appears from this work that he

---

[1] See JRASCB(NS) Vol. IV p.123.

[2] Pjv., p.140.

[3] A.P. Buddhadatta, Theravādī bauddhācāryayo p.103.

[4] Sasissaga kaṇṭhohitadhammamālo - virājeti rāgādipāpappahāro-guṇodāra-haranijaro dharanto - mahanettapasadamuloruthero. Br. Mus. Mss. Or.6611. (178) folio kl.

was at Dädigama which was the capital of Parakkamabāhu V. Rāmacandra Bhāratī, a Brahmin from Bengal who came to Ceylon in the reign of Parakkamabāhu VI (1412-1467 A.D.), wrote the Vṛttamālākhyā,[1] a biographical eulogy on Dīpaṅkara of Ramyasthala who was the primate of the Mānetpāmula. It is also interesting that he was mentioned in this work as the disciple of the primate of another fraternity, the Śailāntaramūla (Galaturumula).[2] It is quite possible that Dīpaṅkara was succeeded by Vīdāgama Maitreya. In the Kavlakunuminimal,[3] a work on prosody written in the fifty-fourth year (1465) of Parakkamabāhu VI, Maitreya refers to himself as Mahanetpāmula mahateriṅdu. He continued in this position into the next reign; the Budugunālaṅkāra,[4] another verse work by him, was composed in the third year (1472) of Bhuvanekabāhu VI. In the Mādagoḍa Plate,[5] the king records a grant of land made to this monk after listening to a discourse during a tour of the Jaffna peninsula. The fact that he accompanied the king on his tours would suggest that he was the royal preceptor.

---

[1] Br. Mus. Ms. Or 6611 (180).

[2] Ibid. folio kī.

[3] viyatun sārū met maha - net pāmula mahateriṅdu - melaka eksat kaḷa - siri pärakum nṛiṅdu haṭa-paṇas sivu vasä me keḷem - kivilakuṇu miṇimala nam. Kivilakuṇuminimal v.87.

[4] diyagos pätiri bhuvaneka bhuja niriṅdu saṅda-pirivas tunehi siri laka raja bisev lada... met maha net pamula maha teriṅdu saṅda-satväḍa vas meda kaḷe met sitin nada. Budugunṇa alaṃkaraya vv. 609-611.

[5] A reading of this inscription was published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Siṃhala sāhitya lipi (1956) p.139. But no critical edition of the record has been published so far.

It would have been evident from the preceding discussion that the Abhayagiri nikāya was constituted of four main fraternities. Of these, the Uttaramūla and the Kapārāmuḷa played an active and vital role in the affairs of the nikāya. But the other two came to the fore only by about the end of the tenth century. It was also noticed that, of these fraternities, at least the Uttaramūla and the Mahānettapāsāda-mūḷa survived late into the fifteenth century.

A slab-inscription from the grounds of the Jetavana monastery, dated in the reign of Mahinda IV, refers to the Seneviradmuḷa as a fraternity belonging to this monastery. The record lays down regulations for the guidance of the residents of the Ratna-mā-pirivena and the Seneviratmuḷa regarding the use of a certain 'water-pavilion'.[1] It is possible that the Seneviradmuḷa was the same as the Senāpatimūla mentioned in the Vuttamālā.[2] In this work, the primate of this fraternity is described in laudatory terms as a devout ascetic and a kind monk. The Seneviradmuḷa finds mention for the last time in the Pälkumbura Sannasa[3] which records a grant of a village to the chief incumbent of the fraternity at the time, by a king identified as Bhuvanekabāhu VII (1521-1551).

It is significant that four of the five fraternities cited above represented the Abhayagiri nikāya while theorigin of only the Sena-

[1] EZ Vol. III pp.226-229.

[2] Pajāpuññabijappitodārakhetto-tapotoysuddhikatāgamghanogho-dayāsihatelassa sovannapatto-virajeti Senapatimulathero. Br. Mus. Ms. Or. 6611(178) folio k 1.

[3] EZ Vol. III pp.240-247.

patimūla may be traced back to the Jetavana. This does not necessarily mean that there was only one mūla in this nikāya. Perhaps, there were more. But it is possible that they did not survive the period of Coḷa rule or were not strong enough to play an active role in the affairs of the Buddhist saṅgha of the Polonnaruva period.

Similarly, it seems difficult to identify any of the known mūlas as being related to the Mahāvihāra nikāya. In fact, it is difficult to trace the origin of the other mūlas to any one of the three nikāyas. It is not even possible to say that the seats of their origin were at Anurādhapure or Polonnaruva or the immediate environs of these cities. It is quite possible that some of them, if not all, were mere provincial fraternities which gained recognition owing to the fame of the teachers who led them and the strength and extent of their influence.

One of the foremost among these was the Selantarasamūha which finds mention in the Cūlavaṃsa. As in the case of the account of the Uttaramūla, the chronicle devotes nine strophes in the chapter on the 'Subjugation of the enemies of Rohana' by Vijayabāhu I, to a description of the origin of this fraternity.[1] And as in the earlier case, this account bears little connection with the passages which precede and follow it.

According to the chronicle, a grandson of a certain king Dāṭhopatissa took up robes and practised asceticism in a solitary spot. Soon he gained fame as a man of virtue and discipline. The sovereign of Laṅkā (laṅkindo),

---

[1] Cv., 57.31-39.

who heard of him and valued his counsel built a large mansion and had him brought to live there. The fraternity of monks which grew round him was called the Selantarasamūha 'as he had left his rocky abode to come and live at the mansion at the behest of the king'. Then the chronicle goes on to make a very interesting statement:

> 'Since that time the sovereigns of Laṅkā make a monk spend a night in the devapalli and if he is approved by the deity, appoint him to the position of the primate of the fraternity, and they abide by the counsel of the monk occupying this leading position in protecting the world and the sasana.'[1]

The whole passage poses a number of problems. Geiger pointed out that it is impossible to determine whether the Dāṭhopatissa in question was the first or the second king by this name.[2] Nor can we proceed any further. But there were only two kings by this name and they ruled within a decade from each other. Geiger has suggested that the 'Sovereign of Laṅkā' might have been Mānavamma.[3] It is perhaps so. But, again, it is merely a guess.

If we rely on the tradition of the Cūlavaṃsa, the origin of the fraternity may be dated to the seventh century. But it is important to note that this information is not corroborated by the other chronicles or the epigraphic evidence. The passage in question occurs in the account

---

[1] tato paṭṭhāya vāsetvā palliyaṃ devapalliyaṃ-devatānumataṃ bhikkhuṃ mulaṭṭhāne ṭhapenti hi-mulaṭṭhaṃ avasantanaṃ yatīnaṃ anusāsana-Laṅkissarā pavattenti palentā lokasāsanaṃ Cv., 57.38,39.

[2] Cv., trsl. Vol. I p.196 n.1.

[3] Ibid. n.2.

of the reign of Vijayabāhu I, and could very well be a legend inserted into the chronicle after a considerable period of development. The first direct reference to the Selantarasamūha is also from the reign of Vijayabāhu I. Yasodharā, the daughter of the king, is said to have erected a mansion called Pasāda for this fraternity.[1]

The second problem is one of location. It is not clear whether the fraternity was based in Rājaraṭṭha or Rohaṇa. In the account of the origin of the fraternity, it is mentioned that it was a 'sovereign of Laṅkā' who built a dwelling for the ascetic and invited him to be his counsellor. Further, the 'sovereigns of Laṅkā' who succeeded him are said to have followed the counsel of the chief monk of the fraternity on the affairs of state. It is unlikely that a ruler of Rohaṇa should be called a 'sovereign of Laṅkā'. It has already been mentioned that Yasadharā, the daughter of Vijayabāhu I, built a mansion for this fraternity. This does not necessarily imply that it was situated close to Polonnaruva. But it is also significant that, according to the chronicle, the monks of the eight mūlavihāras left the capital and set forth for Rohaṇa in protest against the confiscation of monastic property by Vikkamabāhu I.[2] If the Selantarasamūha is included among these eight fraternities, it would also point to its presence at Polonnaruva.

---

[1] Cv., 60.84.

[2] Cv., 61.58-61.

However, there are certain reasons which suggest that the fraternity should be located in Rohaṇa. Parakkamabāhu I, when he requested the monks from various regions to take part in the deliberations leading to the unification of the saṅgha, nominated Nanda of the Selantarāyatana to lead the monks of all the three nikāyas from Rohaṇa.[1] It could also be argued that the silence of the Cūlavaṃsa on the history of this fraternity right up to the time of Vijayabāhu I is due to its origin and early development in Rohaṇa. Nicholas locates the seat of the Selantarasamūha near Mahāgāma.[2] There is no direct evidence to support such an identification. Perhaps, he assumed that the 'Sovereign of Laṅkā' who founded the fraternity was a provincial king who ruled from Mahāgāma. But it has to be pointed out that the presence of monks belonging to this fraternity in Rohaṇa in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I is not a necessary indication of the original centre having been in Rohaṇa. If the monks of the Selantarasamūha left the capital in the reign of Vikkamabāhu I, as suggested by the chronicle, it is quite possible that they settled down in Rohaṇa. But it has to be admitted that the available evidence is inconclusive. The absence of any direct evidence pointing to the continued presence of the fraternity in Rājaraṭṭha or Rohaṇa makes one hesitant about accepting either hypothesis.

---

[1] Cv., 78.10.

[2] UHC Vol. I pt. II p.431.

The statement which occurs in the latter part of the account of the origin of the Selantarasamāgaha is of particular interest. The manner in which the prospective chief-incumbent of the fraternity was made to seek the approval of a deity by spending the night in a devapalli sheds interesting light on the relationship which prevailed between Buddhism and the popular cult of deity-worship. The chronicle states that the custom had been continued since the formation of the fraternity (tato paṭṭhāya), and this seems to imply that it was known at the time the chronicles came to be written.

The very fact that this account was inserted in the chronicle suggests that the Selantarasamāgaha, like the Uttaramūla, had grown into one of the most important centres of Buddhist activity in this period. A monk who belonged to the fraternity occurs in contemporary literature. Saṅgharakkhita who became the head of the Buddhist church in the time of Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A.D.), mentions in the Vuttodaya, a work on prosody, that his teacher was the thera Sīla of Selantarāyatara.[1] But in the prologue of the Sumaṅgalappasādanī, his commentary on the Khuddasikkhā, Saṅgharakkhita refers to Sāriputta as his teacher.[2] Presumbly, he learned prosody from Sīla and the Vinaya from Sāriputta. It appears, therefore, that Sīla and Sāriputta were contemporaries. Nanda of the Selantara

[1] Selantarāyatanavāsika-sīlathera - pādo gurū guṇagarū jayataṃ mameso Vuttodaya (Burmese ed.) 1898 p.123.

[2] sāriputtaṃ mahāsāmiṃ nekasattha visāradaṃ - mahāguṇaṃ mahāpuññaṃ namo me sirasa garuṃ. Sumaṅgalapasādanī (Dangedara Sumanajoti). p.1.

fraternity who led the monks of Rohaṇa at the proceedings of the unification of the saṅgha was also a contemporary of Sāriputta. From this we may infer that Nanda and Sīla were contemporaries in the Selantarāyatana.

The close relations that the disciples of Sāriputta had with monks of the Selantarāyatana are not necessarily indications of the affiliations of this fraternity. On the other hand, Paranavitana is also mistaken when he says that it belonged to the Abhayagiri nikāya.[1] In fact, there is no evidence at all on the sectarian affiliations of this fraternity.

The next reference to this fraternity occurs in the Vuttamālā[2] where the mahāsthavira of Upalantaramūla is extolled as a monk bent on service, pure in mind and endowed with many virtues. He was living at Dädigama, the capital of Parakkamabāhu V, when this work was composed. The term Upalantaramūla is explained as the Śailāntaramūla in the Sinhalese paraphrase. Upala is known as a synonym for śaila.[3] The author of the Sūryaśatakāsannaya who introduces himself as the mahāthera of the Vilgammula claims that he was the principal disciple of Galaturumula mahāsvāmi who lived at the Tīrthagāma monastery.[4] In the Vimuktisaṅgraha, written in the eighteenth year of Vikkamabāhu, identified as the third

---

[1] UHC Vol. I pt. II p.568.

[2] saka-attha hitāpi parattha rato-jinasāsana pālana suddha mano-guna bhusanā bhusanato ca ahu - Upalantaramulamahasthaviro. Or.6611 (178) folio kl. 1 is omitted and 2 is taviro in Or.6611(179).

[3] See PTS. Pali-English Dictionary; Monier Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary.

[4] Sūryaśataka (Baṭuvantudāve) 1949 p.54.

king of this name (1357-1374), both Galaturumula mahāsvāmi and Vilgammula mahāthera are mentioned as the teachers of the author.[1] Galaturumula is the exact Sinhalese equivalent of the Pali Selantaramūla. The title mahāsvāmi suggests that this monk was the highest dignitary among the saṅgha at the time.[2] The other epithets attributed to him like sakalakalāsarvajña, saḍbhāṣāparameśvara and tripiṭakavāgīśvarcārya reveal that he was reputed as a man of letters and an expositor of the doctrine. If he is identified with the monk mentioned in the Vuttamālā, it may be presumed that he left Dädigama after Parakkamabāhu V lost his kingdom, and settled down at Tīrthagāma, most probably identical with Toṭagamuva in South Ceylon. But it is also possible they were two different persons. The Nikāyasaṅgrahastates that Maitreya mahāthera, another monk of the Galatarumula, assisted the hierarch Dharmakīrtti II, in carrying out a reform of the saṅgha under the patronage of Vīrabāhu who was the de facto ruler of the Island during the latter part of the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V (1372-1408).[3] The last reference to this fraternity occurs in the Vṛttamālākhyā which mentions Śailāntaramūleśa mahāsvāmi as the teacher of Dīpaṅkara, the hero of the eulogy.[4] Presumably, the highest office in the community of monks had passed again to the Śailāntaramūla.[5]

[1] Vimuktisaṅgrahava (Homāgama Sīlaratana) 1925 p.215.

[2] For a discussion on the interpretation of this term see p.498.

[3] Niks. (Vikramasiṃha ed.) p.630.

[4] Br. Mus. Ms. Or.6611 (180) folio ki.

[5] See p.498.

The Vilgammula, alternatively called the Velgammula Sarasālgāmamūla and the Sarogāmamūla, is mentioned for the first time in the Abhidhānappadīpikā,[1] a Pali lexicon compiled not longer after the reign of Parakkamabāhu I. It was to become, later on, one of the most eminent fraternities in the fields of literary and religious activity. Moggallāna, the author of the Abhidhānappadīpikā, states that he lived in the Sarogāmasamūha of the Jetavana monastery at Polonnaruva and that he took to writing under the patronage of Parakkamabāhu. From this it may be deduced that the Sarogāmamūla was one of the eight mūlas brought together by Parakkamabāhu I and established at the Jetavana monastery and that Moggallāna was a contemporary of the king.

The origin of this fraternity is shrouded in mystery. The Dhātuvaṃsa[2] mentions a certain Vilgamvehera as one of the monasteries built by Kākavaṇṇatissa. It appears from the same work that the stūpa and the monastic establishment he founded near the lake Seru was one of his most important works. But it is not possible to determine from the contexts of these references whether the Vilgamvehera was identical with the monastery near the lake Seru. However, it is important in this connection that the Simhala Bodhivaṃśaya, written in the fourteenth century, states that one of the off-shoots of the Bo-tree at Anurādhapura was planted at Vilgama of the nāgas, near Seruvila.[3] This reference suggests

[1] Abhidhānappadīpikā Sannaya (Toṭagamuve Paññātissa) 1895 p.161.

[2] Dhātuvaṃsa (Dhammakkhanda Ed.) See p.19 and 48.

[3] Seruvila samīpayehi nayinge Vilgam veherada. Simhala Bodhivaṃśaya (Dhammaratana Ed.) p.190.

that the two places were identical. The value of this reference is enhanced by the fact that the Simhala Bodhivamśaya was the work of the chief incumbent of the monastery at Kalaṇiya who was also the mahāsthavira of the Vilgammula fraternity in the time of Parakkamabāhu IV (1302-1326).

One might suppose that no better authority could be cited to confirm the identification that this monastery was the original seat of the Vilgammula. But thecasual way in which this monastery is mentioned casts some doubts on such an identification. Vilgama is introduced as the 'monastery of the nāgas situated near the lake Seru'. It strikes one as an unlikely way of presenting the monastery which was the original seat of the fraternity of the author. The identification is rendered more doubtful by the appearance of several places under this very name.

A fourth-century inscription from Nā-maluva near the boundary between the Pānāma Pattu and the Badulla district refers among other places to Vilgama. Similarly, a pre-Christian cave inscriptinn from Hennannegala in the Batticaloa district mentions Vilgama.[1] A place called Sarogāmatittha is referred to in the Cūlavamsa,[2] in connection with the campaigns of Parakkamabāhu I against Mānābharaṇa. It was one of the fords on the river Mahavāli where Kesadhātu Rakkha defeated Mahālekha Mahinda.

---

[1] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI pp. 23, 31-32.

[2] Cv., 72.1-2, 31-32.

Soon afterwards, Saṅkhanāyaka Nātha, a general of Parakkamabāhu, led a foray into enemy territory from this place. Codrington has identified Sarogāmatittha with the present Vilgamuva, about fifteen miles to the north of Mahiyaṅgaṇa.[1] It is not impossible that the Nā-malava and Hennannegala inscriptions cited above also refer to the same place. But there is no evidence, archaeological or literary, of a thriving monastic community in or near this place, which would lead one to believe that the origin of the Vilgammula lay there.

The Galpāta Vihāra inscription of Parakkamabāhu, the first or the second king of that name, records that this particular monastery belonged to the Saddharmarājan Pirivena of the Velgammula.[2] The reference to the fraternity as Velgammula is interesting. It is most probably the same as Vilgammula. The change of e to i is not unusual. In a tenth-century inscription, Veluvana occurs as Viluvana.[3] It may also be suggested that the two words vil and vel could sometimes be synonymous and were interchangeable. As Paranavitana commented, 'the Sinhalese word vil which, in literature, means "lake" and is synonymous for sara, is used in common parlance for a marshy land which, in the rainy season, is converted into a sheet of water and is capable of being formed into paddy fields'.[4]

---

[1] Cey. Hist. Jnl. Vol. IV p.134 n.5; JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.36.

[2] EZ Vol. IV p.205 ll.3-4.

[3] EZ Vol. I p.222 l.22.

[4] EZ Vol. IV p.126.

The Pāpiliyāna inscription[1] gives an actual instance of the word vil being used in the fifteenth century in place of vel, in the sense of 'fields'.

The occurrence of the term Velgammula and the interchangeability of the words vil and vel might lead one to postulate that the Vilgammula grew round the Velgamvehera of the inscriptions. This monastery is represented today by a complex of ruins near Periyakulam in the Trincomalee district, revealing a close affinity in style to Dravidian architecture.[2] One inscription at the site is dated to the reign of Bhātikatissa (143-167 A.D.).[3] After the Cola conquest, it was re-named Rājarājaperumpalli and it is evident from the records at the site that it was patronized by Dravidians in the reigns of Rājarāja and Rājendra. It seems to have been considered an important monastery; for this is the only known instance of a Buddhist monastery in Ceylon being patronized by the Colas. It continued to attract patrons after the capture of political power by the Sinhalese, as would be expected, and two inscriptions dated to the reign of Vijayabāhu have been found within the precincts of the monastery. Altogether about twenty-five inscriptions have been found here, and they testify to its importance as a centre of Buddhism. In the Prītidānaka Mandapa rock inscription,[4] Velgam Vehera is mentioned together with the vihāras at

---

[1] kehelsēnā vilin yālaka vapa hā AIC p.106.

[2] ARASC 1953 pp.9-12; see also ARASC 1934 p.8, 1954 pp.12-4, CJSG Vol. II p.199.

[3] ARASC 1954 p.39.

[4] EZ Vol. II pp.165-178.

Māṇḍaligiri, Mahagama, Devanuvara and Kālaṇi as shrines visited by Nissaṅka Malla.

But all these facts do not suffice to make one confident in identifying the Velgàm vehera as the originalseat of the Vilgammula. In no instance has the ruined site at Periyakulam been referred to as Vilgama; it has been consistently referred to as Velgamvehera in the inscriptions at the site. On the other hand, according to the Cūlavaṃsa, Vijayabāhu I repaired a monastery called Velagāmī-vihāra and endowed it with a grant of villages.[1] If this be identified with the Velgam Vehera, as Nicholas has suggested,[2] it would discourage the identification of the latter with Vilgam Vehera. For the Pali term Sarogāmamūla was known and used to refer to this fraternity as early as in the time of Moggallāna the lexicographer.

Places bearing the name Vilgama are known also from the central and south-western regions of Ceylon. Parakkamabāhu I is said to have lived at Saraggāma in the Mahātila district during his period of estrangement with his uncle, Kittistrimegha.[3] Saraggāma, probably a variant form of the name Sarogāma, may be located in the present Matale district. But here again, we do not hear of an important monastic institution at this village.

But there is some circumstantial evidence which might suggest that the origin of the Vilgammula has to be traced to the south-western region.

---

[1] Cv., 60.62.

[2] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.45.

[3] Cv., 66.71; 67.59, 80.

All the known monasteries attached to this fraternity like the Vapasinä at Koṭṭaṅge, the Kälaṇiya monastery and the Galpāta monastery near Bentoṭa were from the south-western region. The Cūḷavaṃsa mentions that Parakkamabāhu I invited two theras, Moggallāna and Nāgindapalliya to come with other monks of the Yuvarājaraṭṭha to participate in the proceedings which led to the unification of the saṅgha.[1] If the first is identified with Moggallāna of Sarogāma who claimed to have enjoyed the patronage of Parakkamabāhu I, it might again point to a south-western origin of the fraternity.

It has to be admitted that neither of these arguments is decisive. The prevalence of all known monastic centres belonging to this fraternity in the south-western region may be an indication rather of the geographical extent of the cultural activities and the political authority of the kings of this period than of the origin of the fraternity. The identification of the two Moggallānas is not clear enough to be reliable evidence.[2]

Nevertheless, our inference gathers strength from information of a more specific nature, found in this region. An inscription dated to the reign of Lokeśvara II (1210-1211), from Koṭṭaṅge in the Mādure Korale of the Väḍavili Hatpattu, Kurunāgala district, records a grant of land made to a certain general, Loke Aramenā, with the proviso that disputes concerning the property were to be referred for settlement to the abbot

[1] samoggallāna therañca theraṃ nāgindapalliyaṃ-yuvarājassa raṭṭhasmiṃ aññe sabbe ca bhikkhavo. Cv.,78.9.

[2] See p.470.

of the Vapasinā āyatana of the Vilgammuḷa.[1] According to a later inscription from the same site, this and some other property was granted by mahāthera Abhaya ... of the Vilgammuḷa to the whole community of monks.[2] It is evident from this that an important monastery of this fraternity was found in this area. Ruins of a monastic establishment are found at the site of the inscriptions; but so far no attempt to uncover them has been made. In this connection it may be significant that certain inscriptions from Rājaṅgane in the same district, datable to a period between the fifth and seven centuries, mention, among others, a place called Vilgama.[3]

The very name of the Vilgammuḷa suggests that it was a fraternity of provincial origin. Many places from different parts of Ceylon claim recognition as its original home.[4] It is tempting to consider with favour the hypothesis of the south-western origin of the fraternity, but it has to be admitted that we do not possess sufficient evidence to warrant a definite conclusion.

Monks belonging to this fraternity gained recognition by their literary and intellectual eminence. Moggallāna is the earliest known. The Nikāyasaṅgraha speaks of a scholar called Sāhitya Vilgammuḷa.[5] The

---

[1] Koṭṭaṅge Inscription No. 1 EZ Vol. IV p.87.

[2] Koṭṭaṅge Inscription No. 2 EZ Vol. IV pp.89-90.

[3] JRASCB(NS) Vol. VI p.93.

[4] The Tisara saṁdeśaya refers to another Vilgama in the south-western region. The messenger-bird is requested to go past Vilgama, Nivaṭu and Doravaka to Dādigama. v.124. Another monastery called Vilgam vehera is found in the Uḍa Beragama area of the Southern Province. ARASC 1933 p.16.

[5] Niks. p.28.

Siṃhala Bodhivaṃśaya was written by a mahāsthavira of Vilgammula who was also the abbot of the Kälaṇiya monastery, at the request of Parakkamabāhu IV (1302-1326 A.D.).[1] This passage makes it clear that the monastery at Kälaṇiya had come under the control of the Vilgam fraternity. The author describes himself as belonging to the Gaṅgatalākaraṁbavalān clan. Presumably, it was the same monk who was responsible for the Kitsirimevan Kälani vihāra inscription of the year 1887 of the Buddhist era (1344 A.D).[2] The monk in the record bears the same titles with the exception that he is called māhimi (P. mahāsāmī). This may indicate that he had been appointed to the position of the hierarch of the Buddhist saṅgha. In this record he claims to have repaired the monastery with the help of Nissanka Alagakkonāra, the minister, and requests that the work be carried on by his successors including the abbot of the Gatārāpiriven.

In the colophon of the Vuttamālā, written in the reign of Parakkamabāhu V (1344-1359), the abbot of the Gatārāpiriven claims to be the nephew of the Sarasīgāmamūla-mahāsāmi and refers to the presence of the hierarch at Dädigama.[3] This seems to suggest that the latter changed his residence sometime after 1344 A.D. The author of the Vimuktisaṅgraha written in c.1374 mentions that the Galatḷarumula mahāsvāmi and Vilgammula/u mahāsthavira were his teachers.[4] It is perhaps to a new head of the

[1] Siṃhala bodhivaṃśaya pp. 2, 200-201.

[2] CALR Vol. I p.153.

[3] Br. Mus. Ms. Or.6611 (178) folio khi.

[4] Vimuktisaṅgrahava p.215.

Vilgammula that the Vimuktisaṅgraha refers here. It is possible that he is identical with the Vilgammula mahāthera, the author of the Sūrya-śatakasanyaya,[1] who claims to be the principal disciple of Galatarumula mahāsvāmi. Evidently, the leadership of the saṅgha had passed on to a representative of the Galatarumula. It was also a mahāthera of the Vilgammula who composed the Saṅdakiṅduru dā kava;[2] but it is not possible to determine its exact date.

The identity of the eighth mūla is a problem which has taxed the ingenuity and the patience of students of Ceylon history for a long time. Of the more serious attempts made to solve this problem the most significant seems to be the work of Māda-uyangoḍa Vimalakitti. His identification has been accepted also by Buddhadatta.[3] According to the Mahāvaṃsa, Vohārika Tissa (209-231) built parasols for eight stūpas, including those at the Abhayagiri, Dakkhiṇamūla and the Mariccavaṭṭi monasteries.[4] The Vaṃsatthapakāsinī explains 'Dakkhiṇamūla' as 'Dakkhiṇamūlanāmako vihāro'.[5] Its context suggests that it was a monastery situated at Anurādhapura. Vimalakitti and Buddhadatta have identified it as the Dakkhiṇārāma built by Uttiya, a minister of Vaṭṭagāmanī,[6] and

[1] Sūrayaśataka p.54.

[2] Saṅda kiṅduru dā samara (Alavu Isi Sābiheḷa) 1961 p.254.

[3] The relevant sections of an article by Vimalakitti are reproduced by A. P. Buddhadatta in his Theravādi Bauddhācāryayo pp. 89, 101-105.

[4] Mv., 36.33.

[5] Vap. Vol. II p.662.

[6] Mv., 33.88.

have suggested that it was one of the fraternities constituting the eight mūlas. Ostensibly, the name Dakkhiṇamūla seems to confirm this identification.

But the Dakkhiṇārāma, though it bears the appellation mūlain the Mahāvaṃsa, does not occur in any of the known sources of the period when the eight mūlas came to be recognized. In fact it seems to have lost its prestige much earlier and does not occur in the Cūlavaṃsa after the seventh century. On the other hand, a closer examination of the context of its occurrence in the Mahāvaṃsa would suggest the means by which it came to be known as the Dakkiṇamūla: According to this passage, 'one of the seven warriors (of the king), Uttiya, built, to the south of the city, the so-called Dakkhiṇavihāra. In the same place, the minister named Mūla built the Mūlavokāsavihāra, which was, therefore, called after him.'[1] It is evident from this that there were two monasteries, Dakkhiṇa and Mūla, presumably adjacent to each other. It is possible that they amalgamated, later on, to form the Dakkhiṇamūlavihāra. Hence, the term Dakkhiṇamūla may not necessarily indicate that there was a fraternity by this name among the eight mūlas.

On the other hand, a reference to another mūla which prevailed in the time of Parakkamabāhu I is found in the Cūlavaṃsa. On the return of the young prince Parakkamabāhu, after a period of estranggement, to Saraggāma in the present Mātale district, Kittisirimegha sent the president of the

---

[1] Mv., trsl. Vol. I p.236.

kuṭhārasabhā and Abhaya, the primate of the Pañcaparivenamūla, as emissaries to persuade the prince to come to his capital.[1] The Pañcaparivenamūla seems to be distinct from the Pañcavihāra which occurs later on in the chronicle;[2] the latter has to be located between Polonnaruva and the river Mahāvāli. The selection of the primate of the Pañcaparivenamūla for this important political assignment is an indication of the esteem in which he was held in the kingdom of Māyā. Presumably, it was a fraternity which grew in this kingdom. It is probably identical with the Pañcaparivenasamūha mentioned in the Bhesajjamañjūsā compiled in the reign of Parakkamabāhu II. The author of the work describes himself as the head of the fraternity and as a member of the Brāhmaṇa caste.[3] The Yogaratnākaraya, compiled at the end of the fourteenth century gives the name of the author of the Bhesajjamañjūsā as Atthadassi and dates the work to 1183 of the Śaka era.[4] We hear of this fraternity for the last time in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu VI (1470-1478) when, according to the Kalyāṇi inscription of Dhammaceti, Maṅgala thera of the Pañcaparivena is said to have officiated at an ordination of Burmese monks held in Ceylon.[5]

---

[1] pāhiṇi so kuṭhārādisabhānāyakameva ca
Pañcaparivenamuladhivasibhaya-yatissaraṃ, Cv. 67.61.

[2] Cv., 72.116.

[3] sāke parakkamabhujavhanarinda-jambu
ddoṇi puramhi nivasaṃ gajakuṭasankhye
brahmaṇvayo yatirkasi bhisakkatanta
metañca Pañcaparivenasamuhanatho
Bhesajjamañjūsā (K. D. Kulatilata Ed.) 1962 p.872.
The phrase gajakuṭasankhye gives the year 1183.

[4] Bhesajjamañjūsā pp. 872-873.

[5] Epigraphia Birmanica Vol. III pt. II pp. 231, 232.

It has to be admitted that no evidence pointing to the presence of this fraternity at Polonnaruva is available in our sources. But it is evident that the Pañcaparivenamūla was recognized as a mūla from the time of Parakkamabāhu I to at least the reign of the second king of this name. Hence it does not seem unreasonable to consider it to have been one of the fraternities constituting the eight mūlas which played an important role in the affairs of the saṅgha during this period.

It is recorded in the Ruvanvälisäya inscriptions of Queen Kälyäṇavati[1], that a certain Pirivatubim Vijayanāvan and his wife gave alms and robes to the monks of this Ruvanväli monastery (Mahāvihāra) led by the theras of 'the seven gaṇas'. On the strength of this evidence, Paranavitana[2] has suggested that the Buddhist church of Ceylon was divided into seven confraternities in the Polonnaruva period. It is relevant in this connection that the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya refers to a viyatpaṭaṭaganaya as an institution restored by Parakkamabāhu I.[3] It has also been suggested that the aṭaganaya are identical with the eight mulas.[4] Both these interpretations imply that the gaṇa was an institution similar to if not identical with the mula.

But, it is clear from contemporary evidence like the Galvihāra inscription of Parakkamabāhu I[5] and the Dambadeni Katikāvata[6] of the reign

[1] EZ Vol. IV pp. 253-260.

[2] EZ Vol. IV p.269 n.2.

[3] Niks. p.24.

[4] Theravādi bauddhācāryayo p.10.

[5] EZ Vol. II p.270 ll.18, 21; p.273 ll.49-51.

[6] D. B. Jayatilaka, Katikāvat Saṅgarā 1955, pp.13-14, 16.

of Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A.D.) that the gaṇa was an institution distinct from the mūla. Especially in the latter, mention is made of both the mūla and the gaṇa. The gaṇa seems to have been a group of junior monks placed under the charge of a senior teacher.[1] It may also be pointed out that the Ruvanvälisāya inscription apparently refers to the seven gaṇas of that particular monastery rather than to fraternities of the saṅgha as a whole.

The term gaṇa could also be used to refer to a group in a secular sense. And the context of the incidence of the phrase viyat pat aṭa gaṇaya suggests that it is in such a sense that it occurs in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya. The viyatnā, according to the same work, was a palace official.[2] Viyat could mean 'learned';[3] and the term viyat paṭ aṭa gaṇaya may connote 'group of eight learned men' or 'eight groups of learned men', who attended on the king at his court.[4]

The foregoing discussion which represents a long and deliberate digression transcending the usual chronological limits of our study was necessary in order to throw light on an important de velopment which had taken place during the period under survey. Eight monastic establishments, some of them going back to about the seventh century, grew during our period into large fraternities which replaced the three nikāyas as the representa-

[1] The term gaṇa is also used to refer to a group of monks who specialised in a particular section of the Canon as the Vinaya or the Sutta. See DAG p.54.

[2] Niks. p.19.

[3] See for instance viyatmi yana manin nosihiya henuye, DAG p.54.

[4] See UHC Vol. I pt. II p.541.

tives of the saṅgha in religious as well as political activities. This does not imply, however, that all the hermitages and monasteries in the Island had passed under their control. The Daṁbadeni Katikāvata, for instance, lays down regulations pertaining to parivenas attached to mulas and then goes on to discuss 'the other parivenas'.[1] Presumably, there were institutions which stood aloof from the control of the eight fraternities.

At least five of these eight fraternities grew within the constitution of the nikāyas from minor parivenas into organizations wielding considerable authority and responsibility. It appears that they soon loosened the bonds of the nikāya assisted perhaps by the unrest and disorganization ensuing from the constant warfare of the period of Coḷa rule. It seems true at least in the case of the Abhayagiri that the growth and expansion of the mūla represented to some extent the dismemberment of the nikāya.

The eight mūlas had gained recognition possibly by the end of the reign of Vijayabāhu I, or at the latest by the time of Parakkamabāhu I. They survived at least till the reign of Parakkambāhu II; we have demonstrated that some of them continued to exist even as late as the sixteenth century. The individuality and independence of the mūlas, however, had been to some extent undermined in the latter days of their existence. For there are instances when a monk educated under the primate of one mūla became the primate of another. This could have been partly due to the

---

[1] Katikāvat saṅgarā p.13.

fact that the appointment of a primate was no longer the internal affair of a fraternity. A candidate had to win the approval of the king and the other members of the saṅgha, in addition to the support of the monks and, in certain instances, the consent of the patron deity of the fraternity![1]

---

[1] mē taramuä niśrayamuktavuvada mula kämati vuvada ayatän välatata hā materun mula nädi piriven adivu balavat pirivenaṭada saṅghasammuti rajasammutīnma täkiya yutu. Katikavatsangara p.13.
Nädi occurs in the sense of 'attached to' (P. naddha from Vnah) in the Ruvanmalnighandu (Wijesekara Ed.) 1914, no. 446.

Chapter 9

THE UNIFICATION OF THE SAṄGHA

The reform of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I which brought about the unification of the community of monks under a single leadership was hailed by chroniclers as an event of great significance in the history of Buddhism in Ceylon. To some, it marked the end of dissension and factional strife which had persisted within the body of the saṅgha for more than a millenium. The Cūlavaṃsa states that Parakkamabāhu brought together the various factions of the saṅgha 'into a union as inseparable as milk and water'. It was no easy task for the king who found it twice as strenuous and exacting as his attempts to gain royal power.[1] To the author of the Nikāyasaṅgarahaya, who lived in the fourteenth century the reforms meant the expulsion of the 'sinful monks' of the Dharmaruci, Sāgalika and the Vaitulyavādi nikāyas who had disgraced the Order and defiled its purity.[2] The Galvihāra inscription of Parakkamabāhu I indited not long after the events seems to consider it a personal achievement of the king and proceeds to illustrate the significance of the event. It points out that the saṅgha had been divided for one thousand two hundred and fifty-four years. In reconciling the differences between the various contentious factions, it maintains, the king had accomplished a task which his predecessors who lived in more propitious times, had attempted and failed to carryout.[3]

---

[1] Cv., 73.21.

[2] Niks. p.25.

[3] EZ Vol. II p.268 ll.4-5, p.269 ll.12-13.

Accounts of the reforms are preserved in several chronicles and other literary works, the most detailed of which is the Cūlavaṃsa. In fact, the Cūlavaṃsa contains two accounts. In the first, found in the chapter on the rebuilding of Pulatthinagara, the emphasis is on the role of the king.[1] The second account which occurs in the chapter on the pious works of the king provides more details about the monks who constituted the council of the clergy which carried out the 'purification'.[2] Presumably, the author is faithfully reproducing the material found in two sources without attempting to weave it into one coherent account. A statement in the first account suggests that such an explanation is tenable. While describing the conditions prior to the unification, it states that disunity prevailed among the saṅgha 'despite efforts made in every way by former kings down to the present day (yāvajjadivasā).[3] Evidently, the chronicler is reproducing an account of the unification written soon after the event. The difference in emphasis between the two accounts preserved in the Cūlavaṃsa is explicable if it is assumed that the author is merely reproducing the accounts he found preserved in the royal and the monastic archives. On the other hand, this statement may also imply that this part of the chronicle was written not long after, if not during, the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.[4] Both the explanations accept the authenticity of the

[1] Cv., 73.1-22.

[2] Cv., 78.1-27.

[3] Cv., 73.19.

[4] R. S. Coppleston suggested on other evidence that the account of the reign of Parakkamabāhu I up to the end of ch. 77 was written by an eye witness. JRASCB Vol. XIII p.62. But, as Sirimā Wickremasinghe has pointed out, this is not the only explanation. For a detailed discussion on the authorship and date of this part of the chronicle, see Sirimā Wickremasinghe, The Age

traditions in the Cūlavaṃsa though a certain amount of exaggeration is noticeable. This is particularly important as they contain valuable details which, however, are not always corroborated by the more concise accounts in the other sources.

The Galvihāra inscription, which most probably dates from the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, is extremely important as it records the code of rules and regulations adopted by the saṅgha after the 'purification'. It enables us to form an idea about the nature of the reforms. Literary works written during and immediately after the reign of Parakkamabāhu I and chronicles like the Pūjāvaliya and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, though not as detailed as the first two sources, add more information to complete the picture.

Reliable information about the date of this event is found in the Galvihāra inscription. This record states that the unification of the saṅgha took place one thousand two hundred and fifty-four years after the first schism in the Sinhalese Order and adds that the first schism occurred four hundred and fifty-four years after the death of the Buddha.[1] Thus the unification of the saṅgha should be dated to one thousand seven hundred and eight years after the death of the Buddha, i.e. in 1164/65 A.D. This should fall within the twelfth regnal year of Parakkamabāhu I.[2]

As mentioned earlier, the first account in the Cūlavaṃsa lays great emphasis on the role of the king in bringing about the reforms. Parakkamabāhu had 'already in the past existences striven after the unification of the saṅgha as something which must be attained'. It was he who assembled

(cont.) of Parākramabāhu I (unpublished thesis), pp. 11-19.

[1] EZ Vol. II p. 268 ll.4-5.

[2] The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, however, dates the synod to the fourth regnal year of Parakkamabāhu I. See Niks. p.25.

qualified monks to officiate at the 'purification' of the Order. He was himself versed in the Vinaya and took part in the proceedings of the council. Though this is obviously a biased account which overemphasizes the role of the king and makes no mention of the contributions of the other participants, the fact that the king took the initiative in bringing about the reforms is confirmed by other traditions, too. The second tradition in the Cūlavaṃsa lists the prominent monks who took part in the synod which reformed the saṅgha but mentions that they attended it at the king's request. It also states that the king was present during the sittings of the eccleciastical court which inquired into the complaints made on grounds of discipline against members of the saṅgha. It was he who expelled the monks who had been pronounced undisciplined by the eccleciastical court. The Galvihāra inscription, too, states that it was the king who invited Mahā Kassapa of Udumbaragiri to officiate at the 'purification' of the Order and to save it from decline.[1] In the prologues and the colophons of their works, Sāriputta and other contemporaries of Parakkamabāhu I record their gratitude to him for the unification of the saṅgha.[2] Both the Galvihāra inscription and the Cūlavaṃsa compare the roles of Parakkamabāhu and Mahā Kassapa with the parts played by Asoka and Mogalliputta Tissa in the third council.[3]

---

[1] EZ Vol. II pp. 268-269 ll.6-11.

[2] Sāratthadīpanī p.1. Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. I pp. 257, 261; Vol. II p.287.

[3] EZ Vol. II p. 268 ll.4-5. Cv. 78.6.

All these sources agree in stating that Parakkamabāhu played an active and important role in the proceedings which led to the reform of the saṅgha. However, it is reasonable to expect that the importance of the part played by the king would be exaggerated in works written during his lifetime. Probably, the members of the clergy had come to realize, by this time, the desirability of reforms and the need for unity, though formally the initiative was taken by the king. Buddhist kings usually associated themselves with such eccleciastical reforms as 'purifications'. Parakkamabāhu was playing this traditional role in lending the force of his political authority for the execution and enforcement of the decisions of the synod.

Mahā Kassapa of Udumbaragiri who presided over the synod was a scholar versed in all the three piṭakas of the Canon. He was a specialist in the Vinaya.[1] The Galvihāra inscription refers to him as a monk of the Mahāvihāra school.[2] Yet, it is noteworthy that the leadership of the movement for reform came not from the main monasteries at the capital but from an institution of the Āraññika (forest-dwelling) fraternity. It does not come as a surprise. The devotion of the Āraññika monk to the austere life in the forest would have been a sharp contrast to the ease and comfort of the life of the residents of the large monasteries at the capital. It is even possible to suggest that the growth and the popularity of the Āraññika

---

[1] Cv., 78.7.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.269 ll.10-11.

fraternity reflects a reaction to this change in the way of life of the Buddhist monk. To the lay population, the Āraññika monk would have would have represented the closest approximation to the ideals of religious life. There is evidence from the ninth and tenth centuries to show that the monks of this fraternity were held in high regard and respect by the laity.[1] The participation of a monk of the Āraññika fraternity in the principal role in the reform of the saṅgha marks an important stage in their rise to prominence and recognition. Many of the monks who gained fame as scholars and hierarchs during the period after the reforms came from this fraternity, particularly from their centre at Udumbaragiri.

Among the many monks from the main provinces of the kingdom invited to take part in the synod were four dignitaries who, apparently, assisted Kassapa in conducting the proceedings of the synod. Their names are found only in the Cūlavaṃsa: 'He (Parakkamabāhu) invited to Pulatthinagara the thera Ñāṇapāla of Anurādhapura with his disciples, the monks of the Sapara province,[2] with the thera Mogallāna, the thera of Nāgindapalli[3] with all the monks of the province of the yuvarāja and the monks of the three nikāyas in Rohaṇa after he had placed at their head the distinguished thera Nanda who belonged to the Vēḷantarāyatana.'[4] This passage further substantiates the observation that the leadership of the synod came from the

---

[1] See p.52

[2] Geiger identifies Saparaṭṭha with the present Sabaragamuva province. Cv. trsl. Pt. II p.102 n.3.

[3] For comments on the significance of this title, see p.313.

[4] Cv., 78.8-10. For Geiger's translation of these strophes, see Cv. trsl. Pt. II pp. 102-103.

provinces rather than the major monasteries at the capital. Another characteristic about the leadership is that the representation was regional rather than sectarian. This is particularly clear in the choice of Nanda to represent the monks of the three nikāyas from Rohaṇa. It may also be surmised that the participation in the synod of monks from the various provinces of the Island would have helped in the implementation in these regions of the decisions made at Polonnaruva.

It is rather unfortunate that no other information is available on these four monks who played such a prominent role in what was perhaps the most important event in the history of Buddhism in their times. The name Moggallāna, however, occurs in three other contexts in the Polonnaruva Period: as the abbot of the Uttaramūla in the Veḷaikkāra inscription at Polonnaruva, as the author of the well-known Pāli grammar, and as the compiler of the lexicon, the Abhidhānappadīpikā.[1] The last two seem to have lived in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.[2] Wickremasinghe and Buddhadatta have suggested that the grammarian, the abbot of the Uttaramūla and the dignitary who attended the synod were the same person.[3] But there are strong reasons which preclude such an identification. Elsewhere, we have adduced reasons to suggest that the Veḷaikkāra inscription should be dated to the period 1110-1111 A.D.[4] Mogallāna occurs in this record as the senior monk in

---

[1] EI Vol. XVIII p. 337 ll. 26-27. Abhidhānappadīpikā (Toṭṭagamuvē Paññātissa), p.161. Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. II pp. 512-513.

[2] See p.229

[3] EZ Vol. II pp. 249-250. A. P. Buddhadatta: Therevādī Bauddhācāryayo pp. 83-87.

[4] See pp.123-125.

charge of the Uttaromūla. Further, he is described as rājaguru; probably, he was the personal preceptor of Vijayabāhu I. It is most unlikely that a monk of such seniority would have been alive in 1164/5 A.D. to take part in this synod. It is also unlikely that the abbot of the Uttaromūla who was the traditional custodian of the Tooth relic[1] would have lived away from the capital in this time. The identity with Moggallāna the grammarian is less improbable. In the colophon of his work, Moggallāna states that he lived in the reign of Parakkamabāhu and claims to have 'caused the sāsana to shine'.[2] One possible objection to this identification is that, according to the commentary on this work written by Rāhula of Toṭagamuva, the grammarian lived at the Thūpārāma in Anurādhapura.[3] The testimony of one of the leading scholars of his time cannot be rejected as unreliable merely because he lived in the fifteenth century, about three hundred years after Moggallāna. Hence, the identification remains doubtful though it is not impossible that Moggallāna went to live at the Thūpārāma after the synod. In the colophon of the Abhidhānappadīpikā, the author states that he became a writer through the encouragement of Parakkamabāhu. He seems to have completed the work after the death of the king.[4] It does not seem probable that he was an important hierarch during the early part of the king's reign. From this discussion, it should be evident that it is not

[1] See pp. 421 ff.

[2] Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. II p.513.

[3] Theravādī Bauddhācāryayo p.84.

[4] Abhidhānappadīpikā p.161.

possible to establish the identity of the participants in the synod with monks of this period known from other sources.

Apparently, the four monks mentioned above constituted an ecclesiastical court presided over by Kassapa to give rulings on points of dispute which arose during the 'purification'. The Nikāysaṅgrahaya states that sittings of the court were held at a place called the Laṭāmaṇḍapaya.[1] Of the monks who were accused of indiscipline those monks who were capable of being corrected were 'led to purification' while many were expelled from the Order. This was no easy task. Some monks are said to have gone abroad to avoid submission to the judgment of the ecclesiastical court. The king gave lucrative positions to the monks who had been laicized to prevent them from creating trouble. The 'purification' was followered by the unification of the Order. The monks of the Mahāvihāra nikāya were themselves divided into a number of factions. These factions were reconciled and persuaded to unite with the adherents of the other two nikāyas.[2]

As pointed out earlier, the accounts in the chronicles tend to overemphasize the significance of the synod in presenting the unification of

---

[1] Niks. p.25.

[2] Cv., 78.12-27. The second pāda of the strophe 78.13 is translated as 'some wished for a sitting in the secret court of justice'. Cv. trsl. p.103. But the passage is corrupt. Variant readings give nisajjamalinavinicchaya which would mean the opposite, viz. that they wanted an open court.

the saṅgha as an achievement of the king and a few monks. The absence of reference to the changes which had taken place within the organization of the saṅgha and the development of relations between various factions up to the time of the unification places the picture of the event out of perspective. Secondly, these traditions, particularly the account in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, suggest that the 'purification' amounted to the suppression of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyas and that the unification was in fact the imposition of the supremacy of the Mahāvihāra over the other two nikāyas. We have already cited the statement in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya that the sinful monks of the Dharmaruci, Sāgalika and the Vaitulayavādi nikāyas, who defiled the purity of the Order, were laicized during the 'purification'. It would imply that the 'purification' did not affect the monks of the Mahāvihāra faction.[1] Evidently, Eliot accepted this tradition as being creditworthy. For he states that as a result of the 'purification' of the saṅgha 'all nikāyas (even the Dharmaruci) which did not conform to the Mahāvihāra were suppressed' and that no more is heard of the Vaitulyas and the Vājiriyas.[2] Paranavitana too has suggested that the ordination of monks of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyas had received 'was obviously considered not valid and, if they desired to remain members of the saṅgha, they had to receive the ordination afresh from a chapter of the Mahāvihāra'.[3]

---

[1] Niks., p.25.

[2] Charles Eliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. III p41.

[3] UHC Vol. I Pt. II pp. 567-568.

A closer examination of the evidence yields a picture somewhat different from that drawn by Eliot and Paranavitana. It is true that in connection with the 'purification' of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyas the Cūlavaṃsa remarks that not a single of the residents of these institutions was found to be without fault. Many had to be laicized. Several were re-admitted only as novices.[1] However, this does not necessarily imply that all the monks of these two nikāyas were either expelled or admitted only as novices. Some would have been merely 'corrected' as the monks of the Mahāvihāra had been. It is important to remember that the 'purification' equally affected, even according to the biased account of the Cūlavaṃsa, all the three nikāyas in the Island.

There is reason to believe that the 'purification' was confined to matters of discipline while the unification merely amounted to an arrangement providing for the coexistence of the varied factions under a common leadership. The standards of discipline were at a low ebb at the accession of Parakkamabāhu I. The long period of warfare among the diminutive kingdoms which arose after the death of Vijayabāhu I and the consequent neglect and loss of patronage had a detrimental effect on the saṅgha. This found expression particularly in the laxity in matters of discipline. Even when he was a provincial ruler, the Cūlavaṃsa maintains, Parakkamabāhu noticed that the monks had abandoned the dhamma and the vinaya, neglected their duties and lived according to their own pleasure. Some monks even maintained wives

---

[1] Cv., 78.25-26.

and children in the villages belonging to the saṅgha. The presence of 'many unscrupulous monks whose sole concern was the filling of their bellies' was a blemish on the Order.[1] It was these conditions which prompted the king to convene a synod.

As the Galvihāra inscription reveals, the katikāvata or the code of rules and regulations adopted at the synod for the future guidance of the saṅgha confines itself to matters of training and discipline of monks and the organization of monastic living.[2] This is particularly relevant and noteworthy, for had the questions of doctrinal teachings been a subject of dispute at the synod, it would most probably have found mention in the katikāvata. Another reason that may be adduced in support of the hypothesis that the 'purification' of the Order was confined to matters of discipline is the fact that Nanda of the Selantarāyatana was chosen to represent the monks of the three nikāyas in Rohaṇa. Such an arrangement would not have been feasible if the validity of the teachings of these nikāyas was to be a subject of dispute.

Even if the reformers did want to suppress the teachings of the schools opposed to the Mahāvihāra, this would nothave been a practical

---

[1] Cv., 69.3-4; 73.5-6; 78.2. The interpretation of the last strophe has been controversial.

saṅghagāmesu saṅghassa puttadārādipoṣanaṃ
evaṃ sīlaṃ tato aññaṃ nevatthi sīlamiccapi 78.3

Wijesinha interpreted this strophe as referring to the maintenance of wives and children on temple property. Geiger rejected this on the argument that the saṅgha as such could not have children and wives though individual monks could. This does not seem, however, to be a valid objection to Wijesinha's translation. For, as Sirima Wickremasinghe has pointed out, the author would have meant that as a general rule the monks had taken to these corrupt practices. Buddhadatta, too, supports Wijesinha's interpretation in

(cont.)

proposition. It is unlikely that all the monks in the Island were summoned to the synod. As the Cūlavaṃsa reveals, even those who were present at the capital could avoid facing the ecclesiastical court by leaving the country, perhaps to return at a quieter time.[1] The chronicles themselves testify to the persistence of 'heretical' views among the saṅgha even after the 'purification'. The remark of the author of the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya that the Vājiriyavāda had survived in the Island and that it was being practised in secret by foolish men suggests that these teachings prevailed in the fourteenth century.[2] The Cūlavaṃsa comments that the Order was corrupted at the accession of Parakkamabāhu owing to the influence of 'a hundred false doctrines'. But it likens the unification of the monks of the Mahāvihāra with the adherents of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyas 'who gave out as Buddha's word the Vetulla Piṭaka and the like which were no words of the Buddha' to an attempt to mix precious jewels with glass stones. Even the beneficent influence of the monks of the Mahāvihāra, the chronicler observes, could not persuade their unworthy colleagues to accept the true teachings of the Buddha.[3] More specific evidence on the persistence of the teachings of

---

(cont.) translating the passage as follows: 'He having perceived that (some bhikkhus) had none of the sīlas apart from the maintenance of wives and children and so forth in the villages belonging to the community...' Cv., trsl. Pt. II p.101 n.1: Sirima Wickremasinghe: The Age of Parakramabāhu I p.309; CCMT p.248.

[2] EZ Vol. II pp. 25-283.

---

[1] Cv., 78.13.

[2] Niks. p.21. See also supra p.359.

[3] Cv., 73.4; 78.21-24.

the Abhayagiri nikāya after the unification is found in the Abhidhammattha-vikāsinī of Sumaṅgala, a disciple of Sāriputta. In no less than five passages in this work, the author criticizes the views that the Abhayagiri nikāya was propagating and in one case points out the similarity of their views with those of the Mahāsaṅghikas.[1] This would suggest that the disagreements between the followers of the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri traditions on matters of interpretations of the teachings of the Buddha continued even after the unificatinn. Moreover, it is noteworthy that none of the works which can be reliably dated to the time of the synod even suggest that the reforms amounted to the suppression of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyas and the imposition of the authority of the Mahāvihāra. The Galvihāra inscription and the literary works written during this time such as the Sāratthadīpanī, Aṅguttaraṭīkā, Vinayatthamañjūsā and the Vinayasāratthadīpanī speak merely of a reconciliation of the various factions of the saṅgha. In these works the authors record the gratitude of the saṅgha of the time to Parakkamabāhu for making it possible for them 'to partake of the divine drink of unity'.[2] If it is accepted on the strength of this evidence that the reforms of the reign of Parakkamabāhu I did not amount to the suppression of the Abhayagiri and Jetavana nikāyas, the unification of the saṅgha will have to be explained in a different manner.

[1] Mahāsaṅghikā pana Abhayagirivāsino ca ditthujjikammam visum puññakiriyabhāvena na gaṇhanti. Tathahi te danam silam bhavana samsuti desananussatimoda veyyavaccam puja saranam patti pasamsa cati attana katapuññanusaranam buddha-disaranagamanam paragunappasamsati imani tini pakkhipitva ditthujjukammam agahetva dasapuññavatthuni paññapenti. Abhidhammatthavikasini (A. P. Buddha-datta) p.46. See also pp. 128-129, 136, 169, 352, 364-365, 387.

[2] Sāratthadīpanī p.1; Vinayatthamañjūsā, pp. 1, 1329; see also Pāli Sāhityaya Vol. I pp. 249, 257, 260, 287.

A summary of the main stages of the history of relations between the three schools of Sinhalese Buddhism should be helpful in placing their final unification in its proper perspective. The most important stage in the early relations between the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri monastery was in the reign of Mahāsena (274-301 A.D.). The monks of the Abhayagiri monastery accused the residents of the Mahāvihāra of being ill-disciplined. The merits of the teachings of the Vaitulyavāda which the Abhayagiri school accepted seems to have been another point in the controversy.[1] The Abhayagirivāsins led by Saṅghamitta, a monk from South India, convinced the king of the justice of their cause. Mahāsena prohibited the giving of alms to monks of the Mahāvihāra on pain of a fine of one hundred (kahāpaṇas?). The monks of the Mahāvihāra had no other alternative but to leave for Rohaṇa and the Malaya highlands where the king's order was less likely to be enforced. It was nine years before they could return. In the meanwhile, the king began to systematically dismantle the buildings of the Mahāvihāra and use the materials to enlarge the Abhayagiri monastery. The complete destruction of the monastery was prevented only by the revolt of a minister in protest. This made the king desist and the Mahāvihāra was re-inhabited. Undaunted by his previous experience, Mahāsena built another monastery within the precincts of the Mahāvihāra to found the rival sect of Jetavana. The monks of the Mahāvihāra left Anurādhapura in protest for the second time and the monastery was left abandoned for nine months more.[1] The activities of the monks of the Abhayagiri

[1] Saṅghamitta is said to have been a friend of the Vetullavādi monks who were expelled to India. Mv. 36.112-113. An inscription from the Jetavana monastery, too, suggests that the Vaitulyavāda was a subject of dispute. See, EZ Vol. IV pp. 273-285.

monastery which brought desolation and destruction to the Mahāvihāra would not have been easily forgotten by the followers of this school.

The monks of the Jetavana monastery came from a faction which left the Abhayagiri as they did not wish to accept the teachings of the Vaitulyavāda.[1] Hence their attitude towards the Abhayagiri could not have been very co-operative at the beginning. Apart fromthe animosity towards the Mahāvihāra the two nikāyas would not have had very much in common. But a distinct change of attitude is noticeable in the reign of Silākāla. According to the Cūlavamsa, a young merchant who visited the city of Kāsi brought back the dhammadhātu in the twelfth year of his reign (529). The king received it with great honour, placed it in a shrine close to the palace and instituted the practice of taking it to the Jetavana monastery once every year to hold a festival in its honour.[2] The term dhammadhātu is suggestive of Mahāyānist connections. In fact, the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya states that the book brought by the merchant contained the teachings of the Vaitulyavāda. It goes on to add that the monks of the Jetavana were at first hesitant about accepting the teachings of Vaitulyavāda but were persuaded to do so by the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery.[3] This is an important incident in the history of nikāya relations as it would have amounted to an overt act of acquiescing in the leadership of the Abhayagiri school.

---

[1] Niks., p.14.

[2] Cv., 41.37-40.

[3] Niks. p.19.

In a debate held in the reign of Aggabodhi I (571-604), Jotipāla, a monk who came from India, defeated the followers of the Vetullavāda. The king was so pleased with the performance of this monk that he took him under his patronage.[1] The Nikāyasaṅgrahaya gives a slightly different version. According to this chronicle, the defeated monks won over the king to their cause through the viyatnā, an official at the palace. Yet, their influence waned after the death of this official. And thenceforth, in the words of the chronicler, the monks of the Jetavana monastery became meek and humble and accepted the leadership of the Mahāvihāra. It is also noteworthy that the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya dates the coming of Jotipāla to the reign of Silākāla.[2] If indeed the monks of the Jetavana school had changed their allegiance, as the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya asserts, they accomplished another change of face by the reign of Parakkamabāhu I; for the Cūlavaṃsa refers to them in the passage cited earlier as having preached the Vetulla Piṭaka as the word of the Buddha.[3] On the whole, their stand on the doctrinal issues which were the cause of controversy between the two main nikāyas remains ambiguous and unclear.

The period from the first schism to the unification of the Sinhalese saṅgha saw nine attempts at 'purification'. Of these, the fourth which took

---

[1] Cv. 42.35-37.

[2] Niks. p.19. Apparently, Rahula misunderstands this passage when he states that 'the monks of the two nikāyas, namely, the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana, dismissed pride and lived in submission to the Mahāvihāra'. Rahula, op.cit., p.103.

[3] Cv., 78.22.

place in the reign of Silāmegha (619-628) is of special interest in this context. It did not concern the whole saṅgha but was restricted to the Abhayagiri monastery. At the request of Bodhi, an enthusiastic young monk from the Abhayagiri, Silāmegha authorized the carrying out of 'an ecclesiastical act' and purged the school of many undisciplined monks. In revenge, the laicized monks murdered Bodhi. But the king completed the task of reforming the monastery and severely punished the malefactors responsible for the crime by reducing some to servitude and by banishing others to India. Then he invited the monks of the Mahāvihāra to hold the uposatha ceremony in the company of the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery. But this request was turned down by the monks of the Mahāvihāra.[1] It was the first instance of an attempt being made, though in vain, to bring about a reconciliation between the two main rival nikāyas of Sinhalese Buddhism.

A greater spirit of mutual tolerance is noticeable since the ninth century when we find the monks of the three nikāyas working in collaboration to mediate in important political matters in the reigns of Sena II, Udaya III, Gajabāhu II and Parakkamabāhu I.[2] From as early as the tenth century, there is evidence which suggests that the three nikāyas assembled together even for matters concerning religion. According to the Cūlavaṃsa, Kassapa V (914-923 A.D.) arranged a recitation of the paritta by monks of the three nikāyas to ward off the dangers of plague and bad harvest.[3] Of course, this

[1] Cv., 74.81.

[2] See p.292-295.

[3] Cv. 52.80. See also p.325.

does not necessarily imply that the monks of the three nikāyas assembled together for the ceremony. But there is a clearer example from the reign of Sena IV (954-956). The Cūlavaṃsa records that this king who was a scholar versed in the teachings of the Buddha used to explain the scriptures to the monks of three nikāyas who would assemble in the Lohapāsāda.[1] This statement is clearly suggestive of the prevalence of friendly intercourse among the monks of the three nikāyas making it possible for them to meet together at the Mahāvihāra. It may be suggested that the efforts of the kings to promote amity among the three factions of the saṅgha would have been, at least partly, responsible for this development.

Further evidence on this trend in the relations between the three nikāyas is found in an inscription from the site of the Mahāpāli alms-hall at Anurādhapura. It has been dated to the last quarter of the tenth century. The inscription records a decision taken by all the monks who received alms at the Mahāpāli to donate their share of rice to meet the cost of repairing the stūpa at the Jetavana monastery.[2] This seems to point to a period of exiguous patronage when monks found it extremely difficult to maintain their monasteries in good repair. It would be, as Paranavitana remarked, more representative of the reigns of the successors of Mahinda IV than of his own reign or those of his immediate predecessors.[3] The most important fact about

[1] Cv., 54.4.

[2] EZ Vol. III p.132.

[3] ibid., p.351.

this record is that all the monks who received alms at the Mahāpāḷi are said to have consented to this decision. The Mahāpāḷi was, in all probability, an alms-hall for monks of all the nikāyas. The fact that these monks decided to forgo their alms to contribute to the restoration of the Jetavana stūpa restores our confidence in the inference that the relations between the nikāyas had developed, by this time, to a level which enabled them to make this gesture of solidarity in a time of difficulty. This feeling of solidarity would have been strengthened during and after the period of Coḷa rule when Śaivism gained popularity in the Island and found patrons even among the Sinhalese rulers.

The revival of the saṅgha after the period of Coḷa rule brought with it the revival of the nikāya divisions. But the nikāyas of this period were probably less organized and more amenable to attempts at reconciliation than before. In this connection, a statement in the account of the reign of Vijayabāhu is said to have built a large monastery capable of housing many hundreds of monks, endowed it with the whole district of Āḷisāra and given it over to the monks of the three nikāyas.[1] It is of course possible that this merely means that the monastery was donated to the saṅgha as a whole and not to any one nikāya. But on the other hand, if this statement is accepted in its literal meaning, it would imply that a significant step was taken in persuading a considerable number of monks from the three nikāyas to live within one monastery and to perform the religious acts together. It may be suggested on this basis that the difficulties that

[1] Cv., 60.11-15.

the saṅgha had to face during the period of Coḷa rule brough the adherents of the three nikāyas closer to each other. It would then appear that, in the unification of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, the king and the leading monks who took part in the synod were assisted by the development of friendly relations which went back to a time considerably earlier than this event.

It is reasonable to expect that the development of friendly relations between monks of the three nikāyas and their joint participation in groups to study the scriptures would have promoted the exchange of ideas and the extension of mutual influences. In fact, there is some evidence which suggests that during this period the Mahāvihāra came to be influenced by some ideas of the 'heretical' schools of Buddhism. Some evidence of Tantric influence is found in the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, a commentary on the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā. The colophon of this work states that it was written by 'the great king Abhā salamevan, born of the twice consecrated queen'.[1] There is hardly any doubt in identifying the author with Kassapa V (c. 914-923 A.D.) who refers to himself in the same manner in his Mādirigiriya and Bilibāva inscriptions.[2]

Kassapa V was hailed in the Cūlavaṃsa as an ideal ruler who was 'pious', 'wise as one who possesses supernatural powers', 'a preacher of the true doctrine' and 'adroit in what is right and not right'. 'He

---

[1] DAG p.295.

[2] EZ Vol. II p.30 ll.A7-11; p.41 ll.A9-19.

stood firm in the teachings of the Leader on the path of deliverance and could not be shaken by all storms of other opinions.' In fact, the chronicler claims that 'he had reached the path of salvation'.[1] It follows that he was considered to be an ideal follower of the Theravāda as taught by the Mahāvihāra. He was supposed to be so well versed in the scriptures and 'orthodox' in his interpretations that monks used to gather at the Mariccavaṭṭi monastery belonging to the Mahāvihāra nikāya to listen to his discourses on the Abhidhamma.[2] Hence one may reasonably suppose that his opinions were acceptable to the Mahāvihāra if they did not in fact represent the views held by the Mahāvihāra in his time.

The Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya makes an interesting statement when it comments on a passage from the Devadatthatheravatthu:

> rudhiruppādanakammam katvā, lē salvana kam koṭa. tumun vuhuṭ selin biňdi budun piṭipaya huṇu le tanin salayi seyi. budun siruru vajrakaya vana bävin säli pahara hotuju le buyinoviya yet. vajrakaya hot jivakayan ata sätin kumaṭa kaňdaviya yat. vajrakaya namparopakramayen nobiňdena bävä. jivakayan sät pahara paropakrama nam noveyi. eheyin vajrakayatavaṭa hani näti yet. ese hot tarun säli pahara hi le tanin kumaṭa siliya yat. viduru nobiňdetuju avuvehi tubuva huṇu tavahi vana seyin uvakum hamiyehi nobiňdetuju antaścalana matrayek ve. eyin vajrakayatavaṭa hani noveyi seyi.[3]

After stating that a splinter from the rock that Devadatta hurled at the Buddha hit him on the sole of his foot and 'disturbed the blood at that spot', the author comments that since the Buddha possessed a vajrakāya

---

[1] Cv., 52.37-41.

[2] Cv., 52.48-49.

[3] DAG., p.5o.

he would not bleed even if he were hit by a stone. Then he goes on to examine how it was possible for Jīvaka to make an incision with his scalpel on the body of the Buddha if indeed the latter possessed a vajrakāya. The nature of the vajrakāya is such, he explains, that it would not be damaged by 'enemy design' (parōpakrama). The use of the scalpel by Jīvaka does not fall under this category, hence it would not affect the nature of the vajrakāya. Taking the case of Devadatta, he points out that though diamond does not break, it is liable to get heated if kept in the heat of the sun. Similarly, though the vajrakāya cannot be injured by 'enemy design', it would be subjected to 'a minute internal disturbance' (antaścalanamātrayek) which does not affect the real nature of the vajrakāya.

The idea that no physical harm can befall the Buddha seems to be present in its germinal form in several of the stories in the Buddhist Pali Canon.[1] But the concept of the vajrakāya as such is foreign to Pali Buddhism. This is primarily a Tantric concept. Treatises of the Tantra school like the Pañcakarma speak of the kāyavajrasvabhāva, vāgvajrasvabhāva and the cittavajrasvabhāva as essential attributes of the Supreme Buddha and prescribe means by which the devotee could acquire such attributes.[2] As de la Vallee Poussin pointed out, the acquisition of these attributes takes the position of a principal rite in Tantric Buddhism.[3] Round this abstract concept of the vajrakāya grew the idea that one who acquired it was

[1] Vinaya Piṭaka, II. pp. 24 ff; Suttanipāta Aṭṭhakathā I p.239.

[2] Louis de la Vallee Poussin, Études et textes Tantrique, Université de Gand, Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres Fasc. 16, 1896 pp. 5-6.

[3] Louis de la Vallee Poussin, Bouddhisme, Etudes et Materiaux, 1898 p.146.

immune from harm. Tāranātha states that Nāgārjuna possessed a vajrakāya and hence could not be killed.[1] The teachings of the Vajrayāna spread from centres like the Nālandā and the Vikramaśilā monasteries to South East Asia from as early as the end of the seventh century. In an inscription from Talang Tuwo near Palembang dated A.D. 684, Jayanāśa speaks of the vajraśarīra.[2] Elsewhere we have cited the tradition in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya that Vajrayāna teachings were introduced to the Island in the time of Sena I (833-853).[3]

The so-called Daḷadā māligāva, situated to the south of the Thūpārāma, is another example. This building, which seems to have stood on a platform measuring 84 x 57 ft., was 62 ft. 6 ins. long and 27 ft. 6 ins. wide. The sanctum had sixteen free standing pillars. Of these the four at the corners were square. The four at the centre are also square and have wide abaci and highly polished smooth surfaces. The remaining eight pillars cut into an octagonal shape are of great interest. For their capitals are ornamented with representations of the vajra. These representations were sculpted in such a way that the vajra was visible from whichever side a devotee looked at the pillar.[4]

The vajra symbol is particularly associated with Tantrism. The use of this symbol as a decorative motif need not necessarily indicate associa-

---

[1] '... da nun der Ācārya einen Vajrakörper hat, kann er nicht sterben.' A. Grünwedel, Tāranātha's Edelesteinmine, das Buch von den Vermittlern der Sieben Inspirationen, p.18.

[2] BEFEO Vol. XXX pp. 42, 55-58.

[3] See p.359

[4] CJSG Vol. II pp. 80-81 Pls. LII, LIII; ARASC 1895 p.3; [illegible]

tions with Tantrism. However, when considered in the light of the evidence from the Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya cited above, it seems to represent Tantric influences at the Mahāvihāra. It would be rash to suggest on the basis of the two instances cited above that Kassapa V was a Vajrayānist or that the monks of the Mahāvihāra and the Thūpārāma had taken to Tantrism. Presumably, their approachwas ecclectic: they would have adopted views of other schools as long as they were not in conflict with their own teachings. But it has to be admitted that this passage indicates that by the tenth century Tantric influences had penetrated into an institution which claimed to be the citadel of orthodox Pali Buddhism.

Some evidence which suggests that the Mahāvihāra came to be influenced by the teachings of the Abhayagiri nikāya is found in two commentarial works written after the time of the unification of the saṅgha. Commenting on the term sacittapakkha in the Samantapāsādikā, Sāriputta states in his Sāratthadīpanī that a novice who consumes liquor without intent and not knowing that it was liquor incurs no sin though an ordained monk in the same circumstances would be committing a pācittiya offence. To support his position he quotes from the Cullagaṇṭhipada and the Majjhimagaṇṭhipada which comment that, just as one who mistakes a serpent for a stick and kills it without intent incurs no sin, a person who consumes liquor without intent taking it to be the unfermented drink from the coconut palm (nāḷikerapāna) commits no offence.[1] But Coḷiya Kassapa, the author of the

[1] Sāratthadīpanī pp. 425-426.

Vimativinodanī, did not agree with this ruling. He devotes a long polemical discussion to refute it. He states that the ruling that only intentional consumption of liquor amounts to an offence was a view held by 'heretical' schools like the Abhayagiri which the authors of the ganthipada works had incorporated in their writings without realizing that it was 'unorthodox'. As a result, Kassapa remarks, it had been corrupting the sāsana up to his own time. He goes on to say that in the past a 'heretical' monk called Nāgasena had propagated this view in the Damiḷa country. But it was suppressed by the mahāthera Buddhappiya who 'purified' the sāsana. The recurrence of this view in the Sāratthadīpanī had helped monks with corrupt thoughts to raise their heads again. It was examined, rejected and suppressed by distinguished monks for the second time. Kassapa claims to have indulged in this detailed discussion to completely refute this view and prevent it from bringing the sāsana into disrepute.[1]

The testimony of the Vimativinodanī would suggest that some of the views of the Abhayagiri nikāya had found their way to the commentaries of the Mahāvihāra. It is also noteworthy that these ideas appeared in a work of Sāriputta written after the 'purification' of the saṅgha. Though the differences of opinion between the nikāyas were not completely forgotten the absorption by the Mahāvihāra of some of the 'heretical' views of the Abhayagiri nikāya would have made a reconciliation possible. One may also surmise that the waning of the influence of the monastic centres of Eastern

---

[1] Vimativinodanī pp. 94-100.

India would have weakened the position of Tantrism, deprived the Abhayagiri and Jetavana monasteries of an important source of inspiration and influence and made them more amenable to the idea of accommodation with the Mahāvihāra.[1]

It has been pointed out elsewhere that the nikāyas of Sinhalese Buddhism were not mere fraternities which subscribed to a particular school of thought. In fact, it seems unlikely that they professed a consistent body of thought to which they demanded unswerving adherence from their constituents. This is particularly true of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana nikāyas.[2] The nikāya was also an organization which possessed a large extent of land and had supervisory control over the administration of the property of its constituents. The growth of monastic property and the development of a bureaucratic organization in response to the administrative needs this created provided the nikāya with an element of cohesion and the main monastery with opportunities to assert its position. It is evident from the inscriptions of the Abhayagiri monastery that the regulations of the nikāya required its dependent institutions to submit their annual statements of income and expenditure for ratification by the assembly of monks of the main monastery or by committees appointed by this assembly. Monks from the main monastery were present at the sittings of the committee of management of the Cetiyagiri monastery when it settled its annual accounts.[3]

---

[1] See p.380

[2] See p.528

[3] For a detailed discussion, see pp.140, 165 ff.

The Buddhannehäla inscription reveals that the main monastery sometimes enjoyed the privilege of appointing the abbots of the minor institutions attached to it.[1] The main monastery also had the responsibility of maintaining the number of monks at the branch institutions of the nikāya at the strength stipulated by their lay patrons.[2] It may also be pointed out that the Vessagiriya inscription of Mahinda IV gives an instance of the chief monk of the main monastery making representations to the king on behalf of a branch monastery.[3] A study of the administrative organization of monasteries reveals that it was one of the main links that brought the main monastery close to the minor constituents of the nikāya and strengthened its unity.

The loss of property that the saṅgha sustained during the period of Coḷa rule and the final confiscation of wealth by Vikkamabāhu I were, therefore, extremely detrimental in their effect on the corporate existence of the nikāya. With the loss of property was lost the basis of the administrative organization of the nikāya. There is no evidence from the period after these events to suggest that the administrative organization of the monasteries ever reached the standard it had attained in the ninth and tenth centuries.[4] The consequent loss of centralized control is reflected

[1] EZ Vol. I pp. 191-200.

[2] See EZ Vol. I p.4 l.1, p. 48 ll.41-42.

[3] EZ Vol. I pp. 29-38.

[4] See p. 193-194.

in the very fact that the leadership of the movement for reform came from the provincial monks representing their particular regions and not from the main monasteries of the nikāyas at the capital. The confiscation of monastic property by Vikkamabāhu united the saṅgha in a different way. It brought them together in a concerted action against the king; the monks of all the 'eight mūlavihāras'[1] are said to have left the capital in protest and gone to Rohaṇa. Such concerted action, though it turned out to be fruitless, was unprecedented and in fact unique. Adversity introduced an element of unity among the saṅgha over and above their nikāya affiliations. Most probably this would have influenced the subsequent developments.

In the preceding chapter, we have pointed out an important development in the organization of the saṅgha which is reflective of the weakening of the organization of the nikāya. Eight monastic establishments some of which can be traced back to about the seventh century grew, by the time of the death of Vijayabāhu I, into large fraternities and replaced the nikāyas as the main groups which represented the saṅgha in religious as well as political activities. Four of these fraternities - the Uturuḷamuḷa, Kapārāmuḷa, Mahanetpāmuḷa and the Vahadūmuḷa grew within the constitution of the Abhayagiri nikāya from minor parivenas into institutions wielding considerable authority in the organization of the saṅgha. The Abhayagiri

---

[1] For an explanation of the term, see p. 414

nikāya seems to have been even in the ninth and tenth centuries a loosely organized corporate institution in which these mulas (var. mūla, āyatana etc.) played an important role. A fifth, the Senāpatimula, seems to have been originally a constituent institution within the Jetavana nikāya. The growth and the expansion of these mulas to some extent amounted to the dismemberment of the nikāyasto which they belonged. The corporate existence of the nikāyas, it would appear, had ceased by the beginning of the eleventh century and given its place to an organisation of the saṅgha based on the mula. This does not imply that the threefold division of the saṅgha on a nikāya basis had been completely forgotten. The five mulas mentioned above would have been continued to be associated with the nikāyas to which they originally belonged. The records continue to refer to the three nikāyas. But in these contexts, the term nikāya was, presumably, being used in a conventional sense. For, in the organization of the saṅgha, the nikāya had ceased to be an effective unit.

The observations made above would place the unification of the saṅgha in quite a fresh perspective. The reforms of the time of Parakkamabāhu, it would appear, amounted to a unification of the eight mulas rather than a unification of the three nikāyas. No direct evidence in support of this hypothesis is found in the accounts of the unification of the saṅgha in our sources. There is, however, an incidental reference which supports it in the Cūlavaṃsa, in the description of the building activities of Parakkamabāhu I.

The chronicle credits Parakkamabāhu I with the construction of eight monasteries at Polonnaruva. Of these, the Jetavana monastery was perhaps

the largest group of monastic dwellings.[1] Within its premises were a round temple in stone for the Tooth Relic, the Tivaṅka image-house, a stūpa, three sermon halls, two libraries, seventy-five parivenas, seventy five long pāsādas and a hundred and seventy eight small pāsādas. Eight ponds were built for the use of the inmates. In all there were five hundred and twenty buildings within the monastic grounds.

Geiger presumed that the so-called Quadrangle at Polonnaruva represents the site of the Jetavana monastery.[2] But it is unlikely that this large monastery was within the inner city of Polonnaruva where the Quadrangle is located. Paranavitana is probably right when he suggests that the site of the Jetavana monastery should be identified with the precincts of the Tivaṅka image-house[3] known today by a curious misnomer as the Demaḷamahasāya.[4] Remains of old buildings round this ruin cover an area more than a mile in extent and seem to represent the site of a large monastic establishment. Seven ponds have been located within these precincts. Paranavitana has also suggested that the remains of a circular shrine to the south of the Tivaṅka image-house may be identified with the shrine of the Tooth relic though it seems to have been built of brick and not of stone as mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa . The chronicle states that the irrigation canal Narmadā went across the grounds of the Jetavana monastery.[5] An irrigational canal seems

[1] Cv., 78.31-47.

[2] Cv. trsl. Pt. II p.106 n.3.

[3] This shrine has the remains of a tivaṅka or 'triple-bent' image.

[4] CJSG Vol. II pp. 169-173.

[5] Cv., 79.48.

to have flowed across the precincts of the Tivaṅka image-house, too.

Apart from the buildings mentioned above, Parakkamabāhu I is said to have erected within the precincts of the Jetavana monastery eight mansions at great cost, each three stories in height, for the use of the theras of the āyatanas. Another large mansion, complete with chambers and terraces on the upper floors, was built for the thera Sāriputta.[1] The Pūjāvaliya confirms the tradition in the Cūlavaṃsa that Parakkamabāhu erected mansions for the eight āyatanas.[2] These statements are of particular interest as they indicate that Sāriputta, together with the chief incumbents of the eight fraternities lived at the Jetavana monastery. It was mentioned earlier that a shrine was built at the same monastery to house the Tooth relic. The Vēḷaikkāra inscription reveals that in the eleventh century the Tooth relic was in the charge of the Uturaḷamuḷa, a fraternity which originally belonged to the Abhayagiri nikāya.[3] It is evident from the Daḷadāsirita that the same fraternity was vested with the care of the Relic even in the fourteenth century.[4] This further confirms the fact that fraternities which originally belonged to the Abhayagiri nikāya were among the eight muḷas the leaders of which took up residence at the Jetavana monastery.

In this connection, it is interesting that in works like the Vinayasāratthadīpanī and the Sumaṅgalapasādanī, written by his disciples, Sāriputta is given the appellation mahāsāmi (var. mahāsvāmi, māhimi).[5] The

[1] Cv., 78.33-34.

[2] Pjv., p.105.

[3] EI Vol. XVIII p.237 ll.18-21.

[4] Daḷadāsirita pp. 49-54.

[5] Pāli Sahityaya Vol. II pp. 287-294.

Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, too, applies the title mahāsvāmi to Sāriputta.[1] Evidently, it was used in a specific and technical sense and does not seem to have been a mere honorific term. For, in the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, a number of renowned teachers like Buddhaghosa, Buddhadatta, Dhammapāla, Ānanda and Anuruddha are called mahāsthaviras while in the same sentence Sāriputta is referred to as mahāsvāmipāda. Geiger tried to explain this term as connoting 'the superior abbot of the monastery'.[2] But from the contexts of its occurrence, it seems to denote a post of greater importance.

The preamble of the Dambādeni Katikāvata drafted by the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu II and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya mention a synod which was held in the reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A.D.) under the leadership of the mahāsvāmi Saṅgharakkhita, the disciple of the mahāsvāmi Sāriputta. He was assisted by the mahāsthavira Medhaṅkara of the forest-dwelling fraternity at Dimbulāgala. Saṅgharakkhita is described in these two sources as the monk who 'administered the sāsana in his time' (tatkāla-sāsanānusāsaka).[3] The title mahāsvāmi is applied to Saṅgharakkhita even in the Cūlavaṃsa.[4] Later on, in the reign of Parakkamabāhu II (1236-1270), another synod was held under the leadership of the mahāsvāmi Medhaṅkara of the forest-dwelling fraternity, disciple of the mahāsthavira Buddhavaṃsa Vanaratana.[5] It was probably the same monk who helped Saṅgharakkhita in the

[1] Niks. pp. 26, 27.

[2] Cv., trsl. Pt. II p.174 n.1.

[3] D. B. Jayatilaka, Katikāvat Saṅgarā p.8.

[4] Cv., .81.76.

[5] Niks. p.27.

reign of Vijayabāhu III we now find in the position of the mahāsvāmi in the reign of Parakkamabāhu II. A third synod was held in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu IV in the year B94 of the Buddhist era, i.e. 1350 A.D. under the leadership of the mahāsvāmi Vanaratana of Amaragiri.[1] All these instances are indicative of the discriminative use of the titles mahāsvāmi and mahāsthavira in referring to the hierarchs who took part in the clerical conventions of their times. The person who presided over the synod always bore the title mahāsvāmi. Further, the monk who bore this title is sometimes described as the hierarch 'who administered the sāsana in his time'. No instance of the title mahāsvami being borne simultaneously by two different individuals is known from our sources. In one instance a monk is titled mahāsvāmi while his teacher is called mahāsthavira. This discernment on the part of the author of the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya is but to be expected. For he himself bore the title mahāsvāmi at the time he wrote this work. Further evidence on the significance of this title is found at the end of the chronicle. When the author mentions the synod held under his own leadership he refers to himself as 'the mahāsvāmi Dharmakīrtti the second who administered the sāsana at this time'. Later on, in the colophon, he describes himself as one who has attained the rank of the saṅgharāja.[2] On the strength of this reference, it seems not unreasonable to equate the term mahāsvāmi with the title saṅgharāja, 'the king of the saṅgha'.

[1] Niks. p.29.

[2] Niks. pp. 34, 37.

The regulatinns embodied in the Dambadeni Katikāvata provide more specific information on the significance of these titles. The section which deals with the organization of the saṅgha stipulates that two senior monks who had completed twenty five years since their ordination and were impartial and exemplary in their character should be appointed to the position of the mahāsthaviras of the 'village dwelling' (gāmavāsa) and the 'forest dwelling' (araññika) sections of the saṅgha and placed immediately below the māhimi in rank. These posts were formally conferred by the king who ruled over all the three kingdoms of the Island. As the presence of too many leaders would be detrimental in its effects on the saṅgha, it warns, no monk other than these two should be raised to the position of a mahāsthavira. And should the post of the māhimi fall vacant through the death of the incumbent, a suitable person from among these two monks was to be appointed to that position.[1] The statements in the Dambadeni Katikāvata clearly reveal that the terms mahāsvāmi and mahāsthavira denoted specific ranks in the hierarchical organization. And the evidence in all the sources cited so far leaves no doubt that the term mahāsvāmi was the title of the supreme hierarch who was placed in charge of the saṅgha of the whole Island.

It was only after the unification of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I that it was possible to appoint a mahāsāmi over the entire community of monks in the Island. The post was certainly in existence from the time of Vijayabāhu III. One may suggest that this was an institution

---

[1] Katikāvat Saṅgarā pp. 12-13.

which became necessary in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I to help consolidate the unification. These considerations together with the fact that Sāriputta is called mahāsāmi in even the literary works written during his time make it possible to believe that he was appointed the supreme hierarchof the saṅgha in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.

The appointment of Sāriputta to the positionof the mahāsāmi raises a number of questions which, however, cannot be satisfactorily answered with evidence at our disposal. One would expect Kassapa who played such a significant role in the 'purification' of the saṅgha to be the first choice for this rank. It is possible that he was advanced in age at the time of the 'purification' and that his death took place not long after the synod. On the other hand, it is also possible that this saintly monk from the forest-dwelling fraternity preferred the quietude of the forest retreat to the busy life of the head of the church. In the absence of any direct evidence on this problem one has to be satisfied with such speculative answers. Though Sāriputta was a great scholar and renowned teacher of his time little information is available on his life prior to his appointment to the leadership of the saṅgha. He mentions in his works that he was a disciple of Kassapa.[1] Yet it is nowhere mentioned whether he was a monk from the monastic settlement at Dimbulāgala to which Kassapa belonged or even whether he belonged to the 'forest-dwelling' fraternity.

However, the evidence cited in the foregoing discussion makes it possible to understand the nature of the unification of the saṅgha which

---

[1] See p. 221

took place in the time of Parakkamabāhu I. It is clear that the unification was accomplished by reconciling the eight fraternities which had replaced the nikāyas as units in the organization of the community of monks and by persuading their leading monks to live at the same monastery and to accept a common leader in Sāriputta. It did not amount to the victory of the Mahāvihāra and the suppression of the other nikāyas as some later chroniclers and certain modern writers claim. It is true that a monk who followed the Mahāvihāra tradition took the lead in initiating the 'purification' of the saṅgha while his disciple, Sāriputta, was appointed the head of the church after the unification. To this extent, the leadership came from the Mahāvihāra . But it cannot be maintained that the leadership came exclusively from the Mahāvihāra; and it is evident from the Cūlavaṃsa that the 'purification' affected all the participants in the synod regardless of their sectarian affiliations. Further, the unification of the saṅgha did not bring about a complete fusion involving the loss of the identity of the fraternities concerned. For some of these fraternities survived for more than three centuries after the unification.[1]

It seems unlikely that the unification of the saṅgha was the blending of milk and water that the Cūlavaṃsa suggests it was. The later statements in the same chronicle contradict this account. There is reason to believe that the difference of opinion and the rivalries among the groups of monks who came to live at the Jetavana monastery persisted after the unification

---

[1] See pp. 424, 441, 448.

and that factional strife broke out no long after the death of Parakkamabāhu I. In his inscription at the Dambulla cave monastery Niśśanka Malla claims to have reconciled the disputes among the monks of the three nikāyas.[1] It is not very likely that this statement concerning the Order made in a record indited at one of the most prominent monasteries at the time was a mere idle boast. Probably, it had a factual basis. In its account of the reign of Vijayabāhu III, the Pūjāvaliya states that he established unity among the saṅgha which had been divided for a long time; this is corroborated by the Cūlavaṃsa and the Nikāyasaṅgrahaya.[2] The testimony of these sources confirms the observation that the unification of the saṅghh did not bring about the end of factional rivalry within the community of monks.

The reforms of Parakkamabāhu I weeded out undisciplined elements in the saṅgha and brought together the community of monks which had remained disunited and divded, as the Galvihāra inscription points out, for one thousand two hundred and fifty four years. The reforms seem to have ushered in a period of intensive activity for the saṅgha, particularly in the literary field. Sāriputta and the group of devoted scholars who gathered round him produced an extensive exegetical literature, both religious and secular. This period also saw the expansion of the Sinhalese Theravāda to Burma and other parts of South East Asia. The decline of the Indian centres of Buddhism may partly explain the rise of Ceylon to the position

---

[1] ...bohō kal bhinnava tubū tun nikāhi saṅguruvan samaṅga karavā. EZ Vol. I p.131 l.21.

[2] ... bohō davasak asamaṅgavū saṅghayā samaṅga koṭa... Pjv. p.110. Cv. 8.147. Niks. p.26.

of a source of inspiration to the Theravādin monks of South Ease Asia. But there is little doubt that the revival of Buddhist activity during this period should be to a great extent attributed to the reforms of the reign of Parakkamabāhu I.

In creating the post of the mahāsāmi, the reforms introduced a very significant institutional change which helped to keep the saṅgha together despite recurrent factional rivalry. For the first time in the history of the Island, the community of monks was organized under a single leader. In the early centuries of its history, the organization of the Buddhist saṅgha was presumably based on the model of the Indian tribal state with which the Buddha was quite familiar.[1] But in the context of the political and social organization that was known in Ceylon, such a system was incongruous and anachronistic. During more than a millennium of its existence in Ceylon, the saṅgha gradually acquired an organization similar to that of the body politic . This tendency would have grown stronger after the acquisition of landed wealth and administrative privileges when the monastery began to perform certain functions which usually fell within the perview of the duties of the state. The monasteries and the nikāyas seem to have been organized with chief incumbents and abbots at their head. There is no evidence, however, to believe that the abbots of the nikāyas played an important role in administrative affairs. The appointment of a head of the saṅgha who in later times came to be called 'the king

[1] The conversation that the Buddha had with Vassakāra, the minister of Ajātasattu, reveals the knowledge that the Buddha had of the constitution of the Licchavis and his admiration of the system. Aṅguttara Nikāya Vol. IV pp. 17ff; Dīgha Nikāya Vol. II pp. 72 ff.

of the saṅgha' appears to be an important stage in the development within the clerical organization of institutions similar to those of the body politic.

The divisions which obtained in the organization of the saṅgha up to the time of Parakkamabāhu were a factor which curtailed its authority and in turn strengthened the position of the temporal power. Hence one would expect that the creation of a unified church under a single leader should have had important repercussions in altering the structure of power in the Sinhalese society. But in practice the situation was different. The Vinaya rules prevented the monks from directly wielding political authority and as such they would not be a real threat to the power of the king. Further, though the saṅgha were unified, in certain respects they wielded less power than they did in the ninth and tenth centuries. The loss of monastic property and privileges and the collapse of the monastic administration deprived the saṅgha of one of the most important sources of power. Moreover, it could also be said that the participation of the king in the reform and the reorganization of the saṅgha gave him a controlling influence over clerical affairs and over appointments to the more important positions in the hierarchy. The Dambadeni Katikāvata stipulated that in appointing the abbots of the eight fraternities and the chief incumbents of the principal monastic establishments only those monks who are 'acceptable to the king' (rājasammutin) should be selected.[1] As mentioned earlier, it

---

[1] Katikāvat Saṅgarā p.13.

was the king who formally conferred the higher ranks in the clerical organization.[1] Such arrangements would have been effective in establishing cordial relations between the clerical and the temporal powers and in deterring the development of the saṅgha into a force which challenged the authority of the king.

---

[1] See p. 498.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing study of the period of about four centuries from the reign of Sena I to the invasion of Māgha reveals its tremendous importance in the history of Buddhism and particularly in the organizational development of the saṅgha. The three nikāyas, which had been the main groups in the saṅgha for about six centuries, acquired a high degree of organizational development in the early part of this period and then disintegrated giving way to a new grouping of the saṅgha based on eight fraternities. These eight fraternities formed the basis of the unification of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I, which created for the first time in the history of the Island a unified organisation under a common leadership.

Of the three nikāyas, the Mahāvihāra appears in the most favourable light in the Pali and Sinhalese sources which, with two exceptions, are works of its followers or supporters. The bias of these sources precludes a correct assessment of the extent of the influence of the other two nikāyas or of their relative positions in the organization of the saṅgha. To some extent, they also distort the picture of the unification.

Little evidence is available on the Jetavana nikāya. From what little is known, it appears that its influence was more restricted than that of the other two. But the picture of the Abhayagiri nikāya which emerges in the light of the evidence examined in our study is that of an extensive organization with an influence not second to that of the Mahāvihāra. It was a group of monks representing several schools of Buddhist thought. The great majority of its followers seems to have adhered

to a Theravāda school which based its teachings on a Canonical and commentarial tradition different from that of the Mahāvihāra. The 'orthodoxy' of the two traditions was a matter of prolonged dispute; each nikāya accused the other of professing 'unorthodox' views.

The scholastic tradition of the Abhayagiri nikāya was not restricted to the teachings of the Theravāda. The teachers of this nikāya maintained close relations with centres of Buddhist learning on the Coromandel Coast and in North-eastern India. Evidence in our sources which had not been hitherto examined by scholars reveals that representatives of other main schools of Indian Buddhism - the Sammitīyas, Sarvāstivādins and certainly the Mahāsāṅghikas - were welcomed and invited to take up residence at the Abhayagiri monastery. And perhaps in emulation of the traditions current at Vikramaśīla and Nālandā, the monks belonging to this nikāya made an attempt to make a comparative study of their teachings.

The Abhayagiri nikāya also had within its fold groups of monks who were receptive to Mahāyānist and Tāntric ideas. The fame of the high standards of scholarship and discipline of these monks reached lands as far as Java where in the latter part of the eighth century a monastery was named after 'the Abhayagiri of the Sinhalese'. The tolerant and unprejudiced attitude that the monks of the Abhayagiri nikāya adopted towards the teachings of different schools of Buddhist thought and the important cult-objects like the Tooth and the Bowl relics they possessed should have gained them wide popularity and accorded to their monastery an important position in the religious life of the people. The ruins

of this monastery which are the largest in the Island testify to the extensive patronage it enjoyed and the immense resources it controlled.

The evidence on the scholastic traditions of the Abhayagiri nikāya illustrate an important characteristic of its constitution. For it is very unlikely that this nikāya could or did enforce the adherence of its members to any one school of Buddhist thought or even that it represented a systematic body of teachings. Hence it is most unlikely that the unity of the nikāya depended on uniformity of religious opinion. Of all the three nikāyas, only the Mahāvihāra can be reasonably defined as representing a school of Buddhist thought. It is, however, possible that the unity of this nikāya, too, was affected in this period when the influences of the Abhayagiri nikāya and of non-Theravāda schools of Buddhism appear to have penetrated into the Mahāvihāra. The appearance of a number of rival factions within the Mahāvihāra by the time of Parakkamabāhu I perhaps represents the results of such a development.

By the ninth century, the three main monasteries had, though the pious donations of their patrons and sometimes through purchase, accumulated extensive sources of income based mainly on irrigation works and land. In certain cases, their interests extended to enterprises like salterns and trade stalls. The saṅgha continued to enjoy the generous patronage of the royal family and of the official classes almost throughout the ninth and the tenth centuries. A particularly important outcome of the relationship between the saṅgha and the king was the voluntary transfer to the monasteries of the fiscal rights and of the administrative and

judicial authority that the state had enjoyed over monastic property. This resulted in a substantial addition to the resources of the monastery as well as to its power. As an institution which owned extensive agricultural resources and controlled many different types of labour including tenant-cultivators, slaves, professional castes, artisans and journeymen, the monastery of this period was deeply involved in the economic life of the people. These economic interests of the saṅgha provide a valuable clue to the understanding of their relations with the laity, particularly with the king.

The administrative responsibilities that the ownership of wealth involved and the restrictions imposed by the disciplinary rules governing the life of monks led to the evolution of a system of monastic administration employing lay officials, similar in certain respects to the administrative organization of the South Indian temple. This similarity seems to be due rather to the affinities of the social and political organization of the two lands than to one system being modelled on the other. The transfer to the monasteries of the powers and the authority that the royal officials had enjoyed elevated the monastic officials to the position of a ruling class. Like their counterparts in the state administration, the monastic officials of this period performed fiscal, administrative and judicial functions and went on official tours to supervise the administration of villages and land belonging to the monasteries.

The system of monastic administration, which is reflected in the

records of the ninth and the tenth centuries at a very high point of its organizational evolution, did not completely relieve the monk of his administrative responsibilities. But it formed an important link in the organization of the nikāya which brought at least some of its dependent institutions under the supervisory control of the main monastery. The administrative records of the Abhayagiri monastery reveal that it maintained a close check on the financial affairs of its dependent institutions. The possession of wealth and the organization which administered it were vital factors behind the unity of the Abhayagiri nikāya, and possibly also of the Jetavana nikāya. And even in the case of the Mahāvihāra, they would have been important elements which strengthened its cohesion.

The growth of monastic property and the organizational development of the monastery had a decisive effect on the life of the saṅgha. It widened the areas of contact between the saṅgha and the laity. On the other hand, it relieved the saṅgha of its total dependence on the voluntary donations of the laity. At the larger monasteries, the monks were not only provided with food, robes and medical attention, but they also received allowances graded in accordance withtheir fields of study. Some monks even possessed sources of personal income. The social privileges and the immunity from the demands of the state that the saṅgha enjoyed and the comfortable life that the monasteries offered drew many undesirable elements into the Order necessitating periodical laicizations and a strict control over admission. In return for the amenities it provided the monastery demanded from its inmates, on pain of expulsion, their complete allegiance and adher-

ence to its codes of rules. The organized monastery attempted to strictly regulate the daily routine of the monks even in its details.

Like the South Indian Hindu temple of this period, the Buddhist monastery was a centre of learning in the Sinhalese society. The saṅgha was perhaps the dominant element among its literati. The ceremonial and ritual which grew round Buddhism and the cultic practices it absorbed turned the monastery into a centre for regular gatherings of the lay community and assigned to the monks important functions connected with the magico-religious needs of the society. The use of painting, music, dance and drama in the service of religion made the monastery a patron of the arts.

The Sinhalese saṅgha of this period maintained close contacts with centres of Buddhism on the Coromandel Coast and in the North-eastern regions of India. The presence of a permanent community of Sinhalese monks at Buddha Gayā and visits of pilgrims and scholars brought in diverse influences which enriched the traditions of Buddhist thought in the Island. The influx of Tantric elements was a particularly important result of this relationship. The attempts of the Sinhalese monks to propagate Theravāda Buddhism in the Bihar-Bengal region did not meet with success. But their activities in this area seem to have brought them into contact with the Buddhist communities of Nepal and Tibet. In South India the Mahāvihāra found many followers who worked usually in close collaboration and sometimes in rivalry with the Sinhalese to expound its teachings. The relations between the saṅgha of Ceylon and Burma, which can be traced back to about the period

of Coḷa rule, led in the twelfth century to the establishment of the Sīhalasaṅgha in Burma. This marked an important stage in the expansion of Sinhalese Buddhism in South East Asia which has left a lasting impact on the culture of this region.

The saṅgha appears to have played a dual role in the development of Sinhalese culture. In a sense, it was one of the most important media through which Indian cultural influences were continually transfused into the Sinhalese society. On the other hand, its influence was restrictive. It was a sieve which held back certain non-Buddhist influences. This partly accounts for the predominantly Buddhist character of Sinhalese culture. Under the influence of Buddhism, the divergent elements of Sinhalese culture achieved a synthesis. This gave the Sinhalese a unity in culture and an individuality which acquired a political significance during this period of intense rivalry between the Sinhalese kings and the Hindu rulers of South India.

The kings would have seen in the saṅgha useful allies who could help in strengthening their hold over the people. The wide influence they wielded over the laity was conducive to the stability of the society. In times of war and civil disturbance, they were helpful mediators who settled disputes. In the king the saṅgha found a generous patron whose authority was useful in the execution of its eccleciastical decisions. Further, the rights and privileges that the saṅgha enjoyed and the position of power that the monastic officials occupied linked their interests with those of the Sinhalese ruling classes. During times of foreign invasion

and of internal disorder their position was adversely affected. The mutually beneficial relationship which brought together the saṅgha and the king finds expression in the political ideas of the time. These ideas, 'legitimized' the position of the king with the sanction of the saṅgha and at the same time emphasized the interdependence of the saṅgha and the king thereby helping to maintain a balance in the distribution of power in the Sinhalese society.

The lack of a clear definition of the relative limits of monastic and royal authority led sometimes to disputes between monastic and royal officials as well as between the saṅgha and the royalty. When Rājaraṭṭha was captured by the Colas the saṅgha was placed in a severe plight. Though there is no evidence of a suppression of Buddhism, the saṅgha certainly suffered from loss of patronage and from destruction and confiscation of its property. The restitution of Sinhalese power brought in a revival of Buddhist activity. But the monks aroused the hostility of Vikkamabāhu by their injudicious association with an attempt to deprive him of his rightful place in the line of succession. Vikkamabāhu captured the throne by force and proceeded to confiscate the property of the saṅgha. Some monks made an attempt to defend their possessions and privileges by enlisting the support of the Tamil mercenaries; but this proved to be futile. If as suggested above, the possession of property were an important element behind the unity of the nikāya, the loss of wealth that the saṅgha sustained during this period would have had a disruptive effect on its organization.

One of the most important developments in the organization of the saṅgha, noticeable in the period after Coḷa rule, was the rise into prominence of eight fraternities supplanting the nikāyas as the main groups in the organizationof the saṅgha. Three of these fraternities were of provincial origin and seem to have grown outside the nikāya organization. Theorigin of the other five fraternities can be traced to the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana nikāyas; their appearance as separate groups represents the disintegration of these nikāyas. Less prominent but no less important was the rise of another clerical faction - the Āraññikas. The devotionof the Āraññikas to ascetic ideals and to a life of scholarship at a time when life at the well-endowed monasteries was becoming progressively worldly gained them recognition and won for them the admiration of the laity. In the reign of Parakkamabāhu I it was they who provided the leadership of the council which reformed and unified the saṅgha.

In the light of our study, the traditional view that the unification of the saṅgha involved the suppression of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana nikāyas appears to be inaccurate. The regrouping of the saṅgha under eight fraternities, the loss of their property and its effects on the monastic organization and the common fate that they suffered during the period of Coḷa rule and in the time of political instability which followed the death of Vijayabāhu I blunted the edge of traditional rivalry among the various factions of the saṅgha. The unification was rather a bringing together of the eight fraternities under a common

leadership than an attempt to impose the authority of the Mahāvihāra over the other two nikāyas as has been hitherto supposed. Though it did not bring factional rivalry to end, the unification gave an impetus to religious activity which is particularly noticeable in the prodigious output of commentarial literature which turned this period into the final phase of the development of the Theravāda. The scholarly activity of this period attracted students of Buddhism from places as distant as Tāmralipti and Kāñci in India and from Burma and Cambodia and helped the expansion of Sinhalese Theravāda to the lands of South East Asia. Perhaps the most important result of these reforms was that, for the first time in the history of Buddhism in the Island, all the rival factions of the saṅgha were unified under a common leadership.

APPENDIX

VIEWS OF THE ABHAYAGIRIVĀSINS

Apart fromthe pioneer work of André Bareau[1], no systematic attempt has been made so far to determine the doctrinal position of the Abhayagiri nikāya. References to the teachings of this school are found scattered in about fifteen literary works. It would seem that Bareau was able to utilize only some of these works. This appendix attempts to bring together all these references and to determine the points on which this important branch of the Sinhalese Theravāda differed from its rival nikāya - the Mahāvihāra.

The sources can be grouped, on chronological considerations, under three heads. Four works attributed to Buddhaghosa, the Visuddhimagga, Atthasālinī, Sammohavinodanī and the Samantapāsādikā, and the Abhidhammāvatāra of Buddhadatta who is said to have been a junior contemporary of Buddhaghosa may be grouped together. The Mūlaṭīkā, a sub-commentary on the Abhidhamma, the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā and the Vaṃsatthapakāsinī, the commentary on the Mahāvaṃsa, fall into another group. These two groups comprise the most valuable sources for the study of the subject. For they contain reports and comments of writers who lived at a time when the Abhayagiri nikāya was still in existence.

Four of the works which belong to the next group, the Sāratthadīpanī, the Vinayavinicchayasaṅgaha and its commentary and the Abhidharmārthasaṅ-

[1] André Bareau, Les sectes.... pp. 241-43.

ranasanyaya

grahasanyaya were written by Sāriputta. Like the Sāratthadīpanī, the Vimativinodanī is a sub-commentary on the Samantapāsādikā. The Abhidham-o matthavikāsinī is the commentary that Sumaṅgala wrote on the Abhidhammāvatāra. These works, together with the Saddhammopāyana, a general work on Buddhist teachings which has been dated to the twelfth century,[1] and the Visuddhi-mārgamahāsanyaya, a Sinhalese sub-commentary on the Visuddhimagga written in the thirteenth century, form the third group.

All the works belonging to the third group seem to have been written after the unification of the saṅgha in the reign of Parakkamabāhu I. But in certain instances they speak of teachings of the Abhayagiri nikāya which were evidently current in their own times. The fifth and the sixth works are of particular importance. As we have pointed out elsewhere,[2] the Vimativinodanī reveals that some of the views of the Abhayagiri nikāya had later come to be accepted by the teachers of the Mahāvihāra. The Abhidhammatthavikāsinī contains references to certain views of the Abhayagiri nikāya which are not found in any of the other sources; among them may be found views which the teachers of this nikāya propounded after the period represented by the second group of literary works. The author of the Saddharmālaṅkāra who lived in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V (1372-1408) quotes from the Saddhammopāyana which he attributes to kavicakravartti Ānanda of the Abhayagiri monastery.[3] Thus, of all the sources mentioned above, the

---

[1] Malalasekara, Pali Literature of Ceylon, p.212.

[2] See p.488-489.

[3] Saddharmālaṅkāraya pp. 603-4.

Saddhammopāyana is the only work which may be regarded as a product of the Abhayagiri nikāya. But the ideas expressed in this work do not differ from those of the Mahāvihāra except on one minor point.[1]

A treatise called the Vimuttimagga by a certain Upatissa, preserved in its Chinese translation, was brought to the notice of scholars by M. Nagai who identified the author with the thera Upatissa who finds mention in the Samantapāsādikā as a teacher of the Vinaya. He also suggested that the Visuddhimagga was a revised version of the Vimuttimagga.[2] Malalasekara questioned this view which was based on inadequate evidence.[3] Subsequently, in a detailed comparative study of the Vimuttimagga and the Visuddhimagga, P. V. Bapat[4] has demonstrated the similarity of these two works in the classification of subject-matters, use of common sources, even common similes and examples, and in quoting common doctrinal views, though they differ in treatment and on certain points of doctrine. In his Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa discusses and rejects nine doctrinal points which tally with views expressed in the Vimuttimagga. The Visuddhimagga and the Visuddhi-mārgamahāsanyaya attribute one of these views to 'Upatissa, the author of the Vimuttimagga' and specifically mention that/in this particular passage Buddhaghosa was considering Upatissa's views.[5] Four of the views are

---

[1] See no. xv.

[2] Jnl. of P.T.S., 1917-19, pp. 69-80.

[3] Malalasekara, op.cit., p. 86-7.

[4] P. V. Bapat; Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga, Poona, 1937.

[5] Vsmtk. p. 113 ; Vsmsn. p. 246.

attributed to the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery; the remaining four instances receive no comments in the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā. On the basis of this evidence, Bapat has suggested that the Vimuttimagga was the earlier work; that Buddhaghosa would have used it as a model in the composition of his Visuddhimagga and that 'Upatissa must be supposed to have advocated the views which were later accepted by the Abhayagirivādins'.[1]

P. C. Bagchi advanced the suggestion that the Vimuttimagga and the Visuddhimagga represent the recensions of the Abhayagiri and Mahāvihāra schools of a common original work.[2] The idea that the Vimuttimagga is a work of the Abhayagirivāsins seems to have found acceptance among a number of scholars.[3] It is quite possible that this was so. But in the absence of any conclusive evidence to establish this identification it seems preferable to utilize only those views which have been specifically attributed in our sources to the Abhayagirivāsins. This is the methods which has been adopted in this paper.

None of the fifteen works mentioned earlier gives a systematic exposition of the views of the Abhayagiri nikāya. The evidence has to be culled from incidental references in a large number of works spread over a period of about eight centuries. It is natural that views expressed by a school within such a large expanse of time would sometimes tend to be inconsistent.[4] Further, all the major sources are works of the rival school-

[1] Bapat, op.cit., pp. xlix, lvii-lix. See also Vimuktimārgadhutaguṇanirdeśa, London, 1964, p.xix.

[2] P. C. Bagchi, 'On the original Buddhism, its Canon and Language', Sino-Indian Studies, Vol. II p.113.

[3] Bareau, op.cit., p.242; UHC Vol. I Pt. I p.390; Encyclopaedia of Buddhism Fasc. A-Aca pp. 26-8.

[4] See for instance views v) and xi).

the Mahāvihāra. In almost all these instances the views of the Abhayagiri-vāsins have been cited solely for the purpose of showing their defects and rejecting them. Hence the possibilities of omission and distortion cannot be ruled out. It is only with a great deal of caution that conclusions should be drawn from this evidence on the views of the Abhayagiri nikāya.

The emergence of the Abhayagiri monastery as a separate group seems to go back to disagreements on points of discipline. Hence one would expect that the controversies between the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri monasteries would centre on the interpretation of the Vinaya texts and on points of discipline. The Vaṃsatthapakāsinī states that the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery 'gave variant readings and variant meanings' to the Khandhaka and the Parivāra sections of the Vinaya Piṭaka and left the Theravāda in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇī to form the Dhammarucika school. Similarly, it mintains, the monks of the Jetavana monastery gave 'variant readings and variant meanings' to the two Vibhaṅga sections of the Vinaya Piṭaka.[1]

The Samantapāsādikā cites an instance when the Mahāvihāra recension of the Suttavibhaṅga differed from that of the Abhayagiri monastery. This concerned the story of the nun Mettiyā who is said to have unjustly accused a monk, Dabba Mallaputta, of having violated her chastity. The Buddha questioned Dabba Mallaputta and on his denial ordered that Mettiyā be expelled from the Order. The account in the Vinaya Piṭaka presents a difficulty.

---

[1] ...atthantara-pāṭhantaravasena bhedaṃ katvā... Vap. Vol. I pp. 175-6.

Evidently Mettiyā was condemned before she was given a chance to defend herself or to confess her guilt. The Abhayagirivāsins possessed a version which stated that she was expelled 'on her confession' (sakāya paṭiññāya nāsitā). In the reign of Bhātika Tissa (143-167) a dispute arose among the monks of the two monasteries on the authenticity of the two versins. The Samantapāsādikā records that the minister Dīghakārāyana who was appointed to inquire into the dispute gave his verdict in favour of the Mahāvihāra.[1]

In the reign of Mahāsena (274-301), the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery accused the residents of the Mahāvihāra of being 'undisciplined' and objected to their use of ivory fans, to the conferment of the Ordination by messenger and to the practice of reckoning from the date of conception the age to qualify for Ordination. They also disagreed with the monks of the Mahāvihāra on the method of fixing ceremonial boundaries and the propriety of spitting on the ground after morning ablutions. The Vamsatthapakāsinī cites the authority of the Mahāvagga and Cullavagga sections of the Vinaya to vindicate the positions of the Mahāvihāra.[2] Presumably the recension of the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Abhayagiri monastery differed on these points.

The Samantapāsādikā and the Sāratthadīpanī mention that the monks of the Abhayagiri monastery objected to the use of a stand (ādhāraka) to accept food. They believed that the physical participation in the

---

[1] Smp., pp. 582-4.

[2] Cf. Vinaya Piṭaka Vol. I pp. 93, 106; Vol. II pp. 130, 277; Vap. Vol. II pp. 676-7.

act of acceptance was limited by the use of a stand.[1]

The reign of Dāṭhopatissa II (659-667) witnessed an important stage in the controversy between the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri monastery. According to the Vaṃsatthapakāsinī, two monks who shared the name Dāṭhāveda, one from the Kurundacullaparivena of the Jetavana monastery and the other from the Kolambahālakaparivena, made a compilation of the Vinaya Piṭaka incorporating the two Vibhaṅga sections of the Dhammarucika recension and the Khandhaka and Parivāra sections of the Sāgalika recension together with their own interpretations and comments maintaining that their version was more 'orthodox' than that of the Mahāvihāra.[2] Kolaṃbahālaka occurs in the Mahāvaṃsa as the name of a hermitage to the north of the city andclose to the Abhayagiri monastery.[3] Probably it was a hermitage of the Abhayagiri nikāya.

The evidence cited so far suggests that the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana nikāyas had their own recensions of the Vinaya Piṭaka for which they claimed orthodoxy. Similarly, they had a commentarial tradition different from that of the Mahāvihāra. It is also evident that there were differences between the traditions of the Abhayagiri and the Jetavana nikāyas. The joint venture on the part of the two scholars representing these schools would have been an attempt to arrive at an interpretation acceptable to both schools.

---

[1] Smp., p.846; Sāratthadīpanī, p.851. This is confirmed by the Vinayavinicchayasaṅgaha p.120 and its commentary p.62.

[2] Vap., Vol. I. p.176.

[3] Mv., 21.5; 25.80; 33.42; 35.94.

At least in one case the views of the Abhayagiri monastery came to be accepted by the teachers of the Mahāvihāra. The author of the Vimativinodanī cites the ruling given by Sāriputta[1] that a novice who inadvertently consumes liquor does not commit a breach of discipline, attributes it to the Abhayagiri school and devotes a detailed discussion to reject it.[2]

Fifteen points of doctrine on which the Abhayagirivāsins differed from the teachings of the Mahāvihāra find mention in our sources. They can be grouped under three heads following the same chronological basis used in the classification of the sources. Those points of doctrine which find mention in the first category of sources and have been attributed to the Abhayagirivāsins in a commentarial work belonging to the second or the third category form the first group. It has been further divided into three sub-groups:

1a. Views mentioned in the Vimuttimagga and a work of the first category of sources and attributed to the Abhayagirivāsins in a work belonging to the second category:

i) The ascetic practices (dhutaṅga) are outside the Profitable Triad (kusalattikavinimuttaṃ). They are merely nominal (nama-paññatti). In an ultimate sense (paramattha) they do not exist (asantaṃ). Being so they cannot have the meaning of shaking off defilements; nor can they be practised. (Vmg. p.24; Vsm. p.64; Vsmtk. p.96; Vsmsnṭ.194).

---

[1] Sāratthadīpanī pp. 425-6.

[2] Vimtv. pp. 94-100.

ii) Purity of progress (paṭipadā-visuddhi) means Access with its constituents (sasambhariko upacaro); the development of Equanimity (upekkhānubrūhana) means Ecstasy (appanā) and Thrill (sampahaṃsana) means Reflection (paccavekkhaṇa).

This is the explanation that the teachers of the Abhayagiri nikāya gave of a passage from the Paṭisambhidā. The monks of the Mahāvihāra believed that Purity of progress itself came within Ecstasy. (Vmg. p.49; Vsm. p.120; Vsmtk. p.159; Abhdhvk. p.352; Vsmsn. p.358).

iii) The Abhayagirivāsin added Inertia as matter (middharūpa) to the traditional list of material qualities. (Vmg. p.95; Vsm. p.381; Vsmtk. p.520; Vsmsn. p.1070).

iv) A Stream-winner (sotāpanna) sets up insight (vipassanā) thinking, 'I shall enter upon the Fruition-attainment (phalasamāpatti)' and becomes a Once-returner (sakadāgāmi) and a Once-returner a Non-returner (anāgāmi).'

The teachers of the Mahāvihāra maintained that such a person would attain the Fruition (phala) (of the same stage but not the Path (magga) of the next stage. It is only by developing the Path that one could attain the Fruition of the next stage. (Vmg.p.127; Vsm. p.603; Vsmtk. p.898; Vsmsn. p.1726)

1b. Views mentioned in a work of the first category of source and attributed to the Abhayagirivāsins in a work belonging to the second category:

v) The teachers of the Abhayagiri nikāya maintained that the 'consciousness of the momentary present' (khaṇapaccupannaṃ cittaṃ) was the object (ārammaṇa) of the 'knowledge of discerning others' thoughts (cetopariyañāṇa)'. For consciousness arises simultaneously in the possessor of psychic powers (iddhimā) and the other. This was explained with simile: 'Just as when a handful of flowers is thrown in the air, one flower undoubtedly hits another, stalk to stalk, and so too, when with the thought 'I will know the mind of another,' the mind is adverted to the minds of a multitude as a mass, then the mind of one penetrates the mind of another at the nascent moment (uppādakkhaṇa), the static moment (ṭhitikkhaṇa) or the cessant moment (bhaṅgakkhaṇa).

The teachers of the Mahāvihāra believed that the object of cognition was the continuous present (santati-

paccuppanna) and the durational present (addhā-paccuppanna). (Vsm. p.365; Atths. p.421; Vsmtk. pp. 484-8; Multk. pp. 194-7; Abhdhvk. p. 387; Abdhvt. p.109; Vsmsn. pp. 1015-18).

vi) 'Psychic powers (iddhi) are "undetermined" (anipphanna); the Bases of psychihc powers (iddhipāda) are "determined" (nipphanna).'

The Mahāvihāra school held that both Psychic powers and the Bases of psychihc powers are "determined" and subject to the properties of the phenomenal world (tilakkhaṇabbhāhato). (Smhvnd. p.308; Multk. (Vbhg) p.169).

vii) The Abhayagiri tradition gave a variant definition of the term asecanaka in the Sy. Nk. Vol. V pp. 321-22. This merely quoted, but not rejected. (Vsm. p.221; Vsmtk. p.284; Vsmsn. p.647).

1c. Views mentioned in a work of the first category of sources and attributed to the Abhayagirivāsins in a work of the third category:

viii) The Mahāvihāra school held that the three viratis are invariably found together in the Transcendental Consciousness (lokuttaracitta).

a) The monks of the Abhayagiri nikāya held that they existed separately (tividhatta) and not invariably (aniyatatta)

b) It is also suggested that they believed in a fourth virati which was invariably found in the Transcendent Consciousness (catutthiṃ niyataṃ viratimicchanti).

(Abdhdhmvt. p.21; Abddhvk. pp. 128-9).

ix) 'Form and other things (rūpādayo), which owing to limitations in duration and spatiality (khaṇavatthuparittattā) are not subject to the field of senses, belong to the category of objects of ideation (dhammārammaṇa).' (Abhdhvt. vv. 30$_1$-2; Abhdhvk. p.169).

x) 'Eye is the sentient surface of phenomena (bhūta) which have the heat-element (tejo) in excess; the ear, nose, tongue and the body are the sentient surfaces of those who have space

elements (vivara), mobility (vāyu), cohesion (āpa) and extension (pathavi) in excess.

The followers of the Mahāvihāra pointed out that there was no scriptural evidence to support this. (Vsm. p.376; Vsmsn. p.1050).

Of these three sub-groups, 1a and 1b may be safely attributed to the period prior to the visit of Buddhaghosa. Though the views in group 1c do not find mention in the sources of the second category, it is probable that at least viii) and ix) represent the teachings of this school in a period prior to that represented by these works.

2. A view attributed to the Abhayagirivāsins in the sources of the second and the third categories falls into this group:

xi) The Visuddhimaggaṭīkā and the Mūlaṭīkā state that the Abhayagirivasins did not accept the static moment (ṭhitikkhaṇa). The Abhidharmārthasaṅgaha adds that they argued that the static moment does not find mention in the Canon. The Mahāvihāravāsins pointed out the contradiction between this and an earlier view (v) of the Abhayagirivāsins. This discrepancy would suggest that this view came to be accepted by the Abhayagirivāsins in the period after the visit of Buddhaghosa. It is similar to the views of the Sautrāntika school on the subject; but this need not necessarily imply any connection. (Vsmṭk. p. 484; Mūlṭk. p.194; Abhsngsny. p.70; Vsmsn. p.1015; Bareau, Les sectes... p.157).

3. Views attributed to the Abhayagirivāsins in works of the third category:

xii) The Abhayagirivāsins did not include 'the correcting of false views' (diṭṭhujjukamma) in their list of ten meritorious actinns (puṇṇakiriya).

It was pointed out that they agreed with the Mahāsāṅghikas in this respect. (Abddhvk . p.46).

xiii) 'Envy (issā) and Meanness (macchariya) may by chance (yadicchavasena) rise together.'

The Mahāvihāra school held that this could never happen. (Abdhvk p.136).

xiv) The Abhayagirivāsins held that, from the sixth stage of the jhānas, the Sphere of Infinity of Consciousness (viññāṇañcayatana), the seventh stage, the Sphere of Nothingness (akiñcayatana), is attained by reflecting on the non-existence of the Sphere of Infinity of Consciousness.

The Mahāvihāravāsins maintained that the seventh stage goes beyond the use of objects of concentration (Abhdhvk. pp. 364-65).

xv) The Saddhammopāyana states that there were three apāyas. The writings of the Mahāvihāra school list four. (Sdhmpy. JPTS. 1887 p.36).

These probably are views propounded by the Abhayagiri nikāya in the last phase of its existence as an independent group. It could be suggested that the need to criticize them arose as the monks of this nikāya continued to hold them even after the unification of the saṅgha. The manner in which they are referred to and discussed in this work also supports such a supposition.

Our examination of the views of the Abhayagiri school reveals that they had a separate recension of the Pali Canon, or of some of its parts, which was different from that of the Mahāvihāra. They also had a separate commentarial tradition of their own. It appears that these works were still in existence at the time of Sumaṅgala, the author of the Abhidhammatthavikāsinī. For this commentator quotes from them.[1] Hence the destruction and the disappearance of the works of the Abhayagiri school has to be dated

[1] Abhdhvk. pp. 46, 128-9.

to a period after the time of Sumaṅgala - probably to the reign of Māgha (1215-1236) when, according to the Cūlavaṃsa, 'many books known and famous were torn from their cords and strewn about' by the retainers of Māgha.[1]

The scholastic tradition of the Abhayagiri nikāya was not restricted to the teachings of the Theravāda. The Vinaya Piṭaka of the Mahīśāsaka school that Fa-Hian obtained in Ceylon was probably from the Abhayagiri monastery.[2] The teachers of this nikāya are supposed to have been influenced by the Vātsīputrīyas.[3] They held views similar to some of those propounded by the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Sautrāntikas. Elsewhere,[4] we have pointed out that monks of the Mahāsaṅghika school and probably those of the Sarvāstivādin and the Sammitīya schools as well lived at this monastery and that an attempt was made to make a comparative study of their teachings.

From about the third century the Abhayagiri monastery took an interest in the teachings of the Vetullavāda. In spite of initial attempts at suppression, these teachings were current at the Abhayagiri monastery even in the time of Parakkamabāhu I.[5] Kern and Paranavitana have rightly identified Vetullavāda as a term used to refer to the Mahāyāna.[6] Hiuen-tsang

---

[1] Cv., 80.67.

[2] Beal, op.cit., p.51.

[3] See p. 24.

[4] See p. 372

[5] See p.476

[6] Kern, 'Vaitulya, Vetulla, Vetulyaka' Versl. en Med. der K. Ak. von Wetenschappen, Letter k. 4e R., D.viii, pp. 312-319, reported by Poussin in JRAS 1907 pp. 432-4; CJSG Vol. II pp. 35-6. See also Rahula op.cit. p.89. More evidence to support this identification is found in the Abhidharma-

recorded that Mahāyāna teachings were studied at the Abhayagiri monastery.[1] A number of copper plaques, some of which contain quotations from the Pañcaviṃśati-sahasrikā and the Śatasahasrikā versions of the Prajñāpāramitā were found at the Indikaṭusāya stūpa situated by the foot of the hill of Mihintale. This is the site of the Cetiyagiri monastery which was an institution belonging to the Abhayagiri nikāya.[2] By the ninth century, the influence of Tantric teachings became evident at the Abhayagiri monastery. Slabs bearing Tantric formulae dating from this period have been found within its premises.[3] It is also evident from a tenth-century record from Buddhannehāla that the practice of initiating novices with the rite of abhiṣeka was known and practised at some of the institutions belonging to this nikāya.[4] The abhiṣeka, according to the commentary on the Mahāvairocanasūtra, was an essential rite which had to be performed before a teacher of the Tantra instructed his disciples.[5]

It is remarkable that in the commentarial works of the Mahāvihāra school no mention is made of the Mahāyāna and Tantric ideas held by the followers of the Abhayagiri nikāya though, as would have been evident from our discussion, they go into the most minute details of their disagreements on the text and the interpretation of the Pali Canon. One reason for this attitude may be that, at least in the latter part of the period under review,

---

(cont.) [redacted]samuccaya (Śantinekatan, 1950), p.79 and the Vibhaṣa-prabhāvṛtti quoted by P. S. Jaini in the Encyclopaedia of Buddhism Fasc. A-Aca pp. 56-7.

[1] Beal, op.cit., p.443.

[2] EZ Vol. III pp. 199-212; Vol. IV pp. 238-242.

[3] See p.371

[4] EZ Vol. I p. 196 ll.B7-8.

[5] See the article on Abhiṣeka in the Encyclopaedia of Buddhism Fasc. A-Aca pp. 125-130.

the monks of the Mahāvihāra, too, borrowed some of these ideas and practices which were not in actual conflict with their own teachings.[1] It could also be suggested that the Mahāyāna and Tantric elements within the Abhayagiri nikāya constituted only a small minority and as such were considered inconsequential. The main challenge to the position of the Mahāvihāra came from the Theravādin faction of the Abhayagiri monastery who gave variant readings and interpretations of the texts on which the followers of the Mahāvihāra based their teachings. Hence, it is not surprising that they wasted much breath combatting these 'revisionist views' which they would have regarded as the more formidable threat.

---

[1] See pp. 484-490

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. LITERARY SOURCES

A. Pali and Sanskrit

Abhidhammamūlaṭīkā (Burmese edition), published by the Burmese Buddhist Society, 3 vols., 1960-2.

Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī (ed. Paññāsāra and Vimaladhamma), 1933.

Abhidhammatthavikāsinī (ed. A. P. Buddhadātta), Colombo, 1961.

Abhidhammāvatāra (ed. A. P. Buddhadatta), P.T.S., London, 1915.

Abhidharmārthsaṅgrahaya (ed. Nandārāma Tissa and M. Dhammaratana), Colombo, 1938.

Anuruddhaśataka (ed. D. A. de S. Batuvantudava), Colombo, 1879.

Atthasālinī (ed. E. Müller), P.T.S., London, 1897.

Bhesajjamañjūsā (ed. K. D. Kulatilaka), Colombo, 1962.

Bodhicaryāvatāra (ed. D. Dharmānanda), Colombo, 1959.

Cūlavaṃsa* (ed. W. Geiger), 2 vols., P.T.S., London, 1925, 1927.

—— (trsl. W. Geiger, translated from the German into English by C. M. Rickmers), 2 Pts., Colombo, 1953.

Dāṭhāvaṃsa (ed. B. C. Law), Lahore, 1925.

Dīpavaṃsa (ed. and trsl. H. Oldenberg), London, 1879.

Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa (ed. C. Godakumbura), P.T.S., London, 1956.

Jinālaṅkāra (ed. R. Pālita), Matara, 1955.

Kathāvatthupakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā (ed. I. P. Minaev), Jnl. P.T.S., 1889, pp. 213-223.

Mahārūpasiddhi (ed. M. Sumaṅgala and B. Dhammaratana), Colombo, 1891.

Mahāvaṃsa (ed. H. Sumaṅgala and D. A. de S. Batuvantudava), Colombo, 1877, 1883.

--- *(ed. W. Geiger), P.T.S., London, 1908.

--- (ed. A. P. Buddhadatta), Colombo, 1959.

--- (trsl. W. Geiger assisted by M. H. Bode), Colombo, 1950.

Mohavicchodanī (ed. A. P. Buddhadatta and A. K. Warder), P.T.S., London, 1961.

Ñyādīmoggallāyaṃ (Burmese edition), Rangoon, 1900.

Paramatthavinicchaya (Devananda), Colombo, 1926.

Rasavāhinī (ed. Saraṇatissa), Colombo, 1928.

Saddhammasaṅgaha (ed. Nedimāle Saddhānanda), Jnl.P.T.S., 1890, pp. 21-91.

Saddhammopāyana (ed. R. Morris), Jnl. P.T.S., 1887, pp. 35-99.

Sahassavatthupakaraṇa (ed. A. P. Buddhadatta), Colombo, 1959.

Samantapāsādikā (ed. J. Takakusu and M. Nagai), P.T.S., 1924-47.

Sambandhacintā (Burmese edition in the Saddā Ngāy collection), Rangoon, 1898-1900.

Sammohavinodanī (ed. A. P. Buddhadatta), P.T.S., London, 1923.

Sāratthadīpanī (ed. Devarakkhita), 1914.

Sāsanavaṃsa (trsl. B. C. Law), London, 1952.

Sīhalavatthupakaraṇa (ed. A. P. Buddhadatta), Colombo, 1959.

Sīmālaṅkāra (ed. Buddhasiri Tissa), Colombo, 1904.

Sumaṅgalappasādanī (ed. Dangedara Sumanajoti), Colombo, 1898.

Sūryaśataka (ed. D. A. de S. Batuwantudava), Colombo, 1949.

Sūtrālaṅkara (trsl. E. Huber), Paris, 1908.

Vaṃsatthapakāsinī (ed. G. P. Malalasekara), P.T.S., London, 1935.

Vimativinodanī (ed. Beratudāve Dhammādhāra Tissa), Colombo, 1935.

Vinaya Piṭaka (ed. H. Oldenberg), 5 vols., London, 1879-83.

Vinayatthamañjūsā (ed. Uyangoḍa Piyatissa), Colombo, 1901-1915.

Vinayavinicchayasaṅgaha (Burmese edition by Maung Lin), Rangoon, 1909.

Vinayavinicchayasaṅgahaṭīkā *(ed. Koṭṭagoḍa Dhammānanda)(Three parts - incomplete). Colombo, 1907.

---- (Burmese edition) Rangoon, 1903.

Visuddhimagga *(ed. H. C. Warren and D. Kosambi), London, 1950.

---- Translated as the Path of Purity by Pe Maung Tin, London 1923-

Visuddhimaggaṭīkā (Burmese edition by Ū Hpye), 2 vols., Rangoon, 1909-10.

Vuttodaya (Burmese edition), 1898.

B. Sinhalese and Tamil

Abhidhānappadīpikāsannaya (ed. Toṭagamuve Paññātissa), 1895.

Abhidharmārthasaṅgrahasanyaya (ed. Toṭagamuve Paññāmoli), Pāliyagoḍa, 1897.

Daladā-pūjāvaliya (ed. Kaṇadulle Ratanaraṃsi), Colombo, 1954.

Daḷadāsirita (ed. Välivitiye Sorata), Colombo, 1955.

Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya (ed. Mäda-uyangoḍa Vimalakīrtti and Nāhinne Sominda), Colombo, 1960.

Dharmapradīpikā (ed. Ratmalāne, Dharmārāma), Kälaniya, 1951.

Dhātuvaṃsa (ed. Gintoṭa Dhammakkhanda), Dodanduva, 1890.

Elu-attanagaluvaṃsaya (ed. Simon de Silva),Colombo, 1944.

Jātaka Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya (ed. D. B. Jayatilaka), Colombo, 1943.

Jātaka Gāthā Sannaya (ed. B. Dharmmaratana), Väligama, 1927.

Kudusikha hā Purātana Sannaya (ed. Hikkaduve Sumaṅgala), Colombo, 1954.

Mahābodhivaṃsa Ganthipada Vivaraṇaya (ed. Ratmalāne Dhammārāma), Pāliyagoḍa, 1910.

Mahārūpasiddhi Sanyaya (ed. M. Sumaṅgala and B. Dhammaratana), Colombo, 1891.

Muvadevdā (ed. A. Vimalanandi), Ambalangoda, 1949.

Nikāyasaṅgrahaya (ed. D. M. de Z. Wickremasinghe), Colombo, 1890.

---- *(ed. Veragoda Amaramoli), Colombo, 1955.

Padasādhana Sanyaya (ed. Ratmalāne Dharmānanda), Kälaṇiya, 1932.

Periya-purāṇam and the Tiruvātavūrar-purāṇam, Translated into German as the Sivaitische Heligenlegenden by H. W. Schomerus, Jena, 1925.

Pūjāvaliya (ed. Bentara Saddhātissa), Panadura, 1930.

---- *(ed. A. V. Suravīra), Colombo, 1961.

Rājāvaliya (ed. B. Gunasekara), Colombo, 1953.

Ruvanmal Nighaṇḍu (ed. D. P. de Alwis Wijesekara), 1914.

Saddharmaratnākaraya (ed. Kosgoda Ñāṇavimala), Colombo, 1931.

Saddharmālaṅkāra (ed. Bentara Saddhātissa), Pānadura, 1934.

Saṅdakiṅdurudā Samara (ed. Alavu Isi Säbihela), Colombo, 1961.

Simhala Bodhivaṃśaya (ed. Dharmaratana), Matara, 1911.

Siyabaslakara (ed. H. Ñāṇātilaka and H. Ñāṇasiha), Colombo, 1933.

Taṅcaivānankovai (ed. S. R. Rāmasāmi Pillai), Madras, 1952.

Vimuktisaṅgrahava (ed. Homāgama Sīlaratana), Homagamu, 1925.

Vesaturudā Sanne (ed. D. E. Hettiaracci), Colombo, 1950.

Visuddhimārgamahāsanyaya (ed. Bentara Saddhātissa), Kalutara, 1949-55.

C. Other Languages

Beal, Samuel, Chinese Accounts of India, Calcutta, 1957-8.

The Blue Annals (trsl. G. N. Roerich), 2 Pts., Calcutta, 1949, 1953.

Bu-ston, The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet, (trsl. E. O. Obermiller), Heidelberg, 1931.

Grünwedel, A, Tāranātha's Edelsteinmine, das Buch vn den Vermittlern der Sieben Inspirationen, Petrograd., 1914.

Hmaman Yazawinkyī, Translated into English as the Glass Palace Chronicle by Pe Maung Tin and G. H. Luce, London, 1923.

I-tsing, A Record of the Buddhist Religion,(trsl. J. Takakusu), Oxford, 1896.

Maha Yazawinkyī (ed. Saya Pwa), Rangoon, 1926-32.

Notton, C., Histoire du Dhammarāja et notre Seigneur, Annals du Siam, Vol. I, Paris, 1926.

Rekawi Prapañca, The Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, translated into English as Java in the 14th Century - a Study in Cultural History by Theodore G. Th. Pigeaud, The Hague, 1960-4.

Schiefner, A., Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, Petersburg, 1869.

NOTE: Unless otherwise stated, all footnotes refer to editions marked with an asterisk.

D. Manuscripts

Aṣṭasahasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, Cambridge University Library, MS. Add. 1643.

Nikāyasaṅgrahaya, British Museum Manuscripts, Or. 2702, Or.6606(10), Or.6606(11), Or.6606(48).

Unidentified Sinhalese Manuscript from the Sa-skya monastery in Tibet. K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna. (see supra, p.378)

Vṛttamālākhyā, British Museum Manuscript Or.6611(180).

Vuttamālā, British Museum Manuscripts, Or.6611(178), Or.6611(179).

II. EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES

Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy, Madras, 1887- (in progress)

Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Progress Reports and Annual Reports, Colombo, 1890 - (in progress).

Archaeological Survey of Indian, Annual Reports, Calcutta, 1903 - (in progress)

—— Memoirs, 1919 - (in progress).

Bosch, F. D. K., 'De Inscriptie van Keloerak', Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal=, Land=, en Volkenkunde, LXVIII, 1928, pp. 1-64.

Coedès, G., Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, Bangkok, 1924-9.

—— 'Les inscriptions malaises de Çrîvijaya', BEFEO, Vol. XXX, 1930, pp.

—— Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, Deuxième partie: Inscriptions de Dvaravati, de Çrivijaya et de Lavo, Bangkok, 1961.

Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum:
E. Hultsch (ed.) Vol. I, Inscriptions of Asoka, London, 1925.
J. F. Fleet (ed) Vol. III, Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings, London, 1888.

Epigraphia Birmanica, Rangoon, 1949 - (in progress).

Epigraphia Indica, Calcutta and Delhi, 1892- (in progress)

Epigraphia Zeylanica, London and Colombo, 1904 - (in progress).

Epigraphia Carnatica, Bangalore, 1886 - (in progress).

Epigraphical Summary, Ceylon Journal of Science, Sec. G, Vol.s I and II, Colombo, 1924-33.

Kanapathi Pillai, K., 'A Pillar Inscription from Moragahawela', UCR Vol. XVIII (1960), pp. 157-62.

Luce, G. H. and Pe Maung Tin, Inscriptions of Burma, 5 Portfolios, Oxford, 1933-56.

Müller, Eduard, Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon, 2 vols., London, 1883.

Paranavitana, S., Sigiri Graffiti, being Sinhalese Verse of the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Centuries, 2 vols., London, 1956.

Sein Ko, Taw, 'A Preliminary Study of the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of Dhammaceti', Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXII, 1893, pp. 11-17, 29-53, 150-59, 206-13, 236-43, 274-75.

South Indian Inscriptions, Madras, 1890 - (in progress).

III MODERN WORKS

Adikaram, E. W., The Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon (or The State of Budshism in Ceylon as Revealed by the Pali Commentaries of the 5th Century A.D.)., Colombo, 1953.

Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Progress Reports and Annual Reports (Colombo, 1890 - (in progress).

——— Memoirs (Colombo, 1924- (in progress).

Ariyapala, M. B., Society in Mediaeval Ceylon (The State of Society in Ceylon as Depicted in the Saddharmaratanavaliya and other Literature of the Thirteenth Century), Colombo, 1956.

Arunachalam, P., 'Polonnaruva Bronzes and Śiva worship and Symbolism', JRASCB Vol. XXIV, No. 68 (1915-16), pp. 189-222.

Bapat, P. V., Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga, Poona, 1937.

Bareau, André, 'Trois traités sur les sectes des à Vasumitra, Bhavya et Vinītadeva', JA., 1954, pp. 229-233.

--- Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule, Saigon, 1955.

Bhattacaryya, B., The Indian Buddhist Iconography, London, 1924.

Bhattasali, N. K., Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanic Sculptures in The Dacca Museum, Dacca, 1924.

Bode, M., The Pali Literature of Burma, London, 1909.

Boisellier, J., La statuaire khmère et son evolution, Saigon, 1955.

Bosch, F. D. K., Selected Studies in Indonesian Archaeology, The Hague, 1961.

Briggs, L. P., 'The Syncretism of Religions in South East Asia especially in the Khmer Empire', Jnl. of the Amer. Or. Soc. (1951), Pt. 2, pp. 30-49.

Buddhadatta, A. P., 'Were there Two Elders by the Name Chappaṭa', UCR Vol. IX, (1951), pp. 69-75.

--- Theravādī bauddhācāryayo, Colombo, 1960.

--- Pāli sāhityaya, 2 vols., Ambalangoda, 1960-2.

Chen, K., 'The Economic Background of the Hui Chang Suppression of Buddhism', Harvard Journal Asiatic Studies, Vol. XIX, 1956, pp. 67-105.

Codrington, H. W., Ceylon Coins and Currency, Colombo, 1924.

--- Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon, Colombo, 1938.

--- 'Notes on Ceylon Topography in the Twelfth Century', JRASCB, Vol. XXIX, No. 75 (1922), 62-74, Vol. XXX (1925), pp. 70-91.

Coedès, G., 'Note sur l'apothéose au Cambodge', Bull. de la commission archéo. de l'Indochine, Paris, 1911.

--- Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonesie, Paris, 1964.

Coomaraswamy, A. K., 'Mahāyāna Buddhist Images from Ceylon and Java', JRAS 1909, pp. 283-297.

Coomaraswamy, A.K., Bronzes from Ceylon, Memoire of the Colombo Museum, Ser. A, No. 1, 1914.

--- Catalogue of the Indian Collection in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1923.

Cunningham, A., Mahabodhi, or the Great Buddhist Temple under the Bodhi Tree at Buddha Gaya, London, 1892.

de Casparis, J. G., 'New evidence on Cultural Relations between Java and Ceylon in Ancient Times', Artibus Asiae, Vol. XXIV, (1962), pp. 241-248.

Demiéville, P., L'origine des sectes-bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha, Mélanges chinois et boudhiques, tome 1, Bruxelles, 1932.

de Silva, W. A, 'A Contribution to the Study of Economic and Social Organization in Early times,' JRASCB Vol. XXXI, No. 81, (1928), pp.62-76.

Devendra, D. T., The Buddha Image and Ceylon, Kandy, 1957.

Dupont, Pierre, L'archéologie mône du Dvāravatī, Paris, 1959.

Dutt, Nalinaksa, Early Monastic Buddhism, 2 vols., Calcutta, 1941-5.

Dutt, S., Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, London, 1962.

Eliot, Charles, Hinduism and Buddhism, 3 vols., London, 1954.

Fernando, P. E. E., 'Development of the Sinhalese Script from the 8th Century A.D. to the 15th Century A.D.', UCR, Vol. VIII (1950), pp. 222-243.

--- 'Tantric Influences on the Scultpures at Galvihāra, Polonnaruva,' UCR, Vol. XVIII (1960), pp. 50-67.

Foucher, A. Études sur l'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde d'après des documents nouveaux, Paris, 1900-5.

Geiger, W., Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, Wiesbaden, 1960.

Gernet, Jacques, Les aspects économiques du boudhisme dans la société chinoise du Ve au Xe siècle, Saigon, 1956.

Godakumbura, C., 'References to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature', UCR Vol. I (1943), pp. 86-93.

--- 'Bronzes from Polonnaruva', JRASCB(NS), Vol. VII, Pt. 2, (1961), pp. 239-53.

Goloubew, V., 'The Art of India and Indo-China with Special Reference to Ceylon', JRASCB (Vol. XXXI, No. 83, 1936 pp. 455-70.

Grünwedel, A., Mythologie des Buddhismus in Tibet und der Mongolei, Leipzig, 1900.

Harvey, G. E., History of Burma, London, 1925.

Hla, Maung, 'The Chronological Tables of Kings of Burma', Jnl. of the Burm. Res. Soc., Vol. XIII pp. 82-95.

Jayatilaka, D. B., Simhala sāhitya lipi, Maharagama, 1956.

Kern, H., Histoire du bouddhisme dans l'Inde, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliotheque d'etudes, tome 11, Paris, 1903.

Levi, M. Sylvain, 'Chino-Sinhalese Relations' (trsl. from French by John M. Seneviratne) JRASCB Vol. XXIV, No. 68 (1915-6), pp. 74-106.

Luce, G. H., 'Monks of the Pagan Dynasty', Jnl. of the Burm. Res. Soc. Vol. XXXVI (1953), Pt. I, pp. 1-20.

Majumdar, R. C., The History of Bengal, Dacca, 1943.

Malalasekara, G. P., The Pali Literature of Ceylon, London,1928.

Masson, J., La religion populaire dans le canon bouddhique pāli, Louvain, 1942.

Minaev, I. P., Recherches sur le bouddhisme, Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, Tome 4, Paris, 1892.

Mode, Heinz, Die Buddhistische Plastik auf Ceylon, Leipzig, 1963.

Mitra, Rājendralāl, Buddha Gaya, the Hermitage of Sakyamuni, Calcutta, 1878.

Murti, C. V., The Central Philosophy of Buddhism, London, 1960.

Nicholas, C. J., Historical Topography of Ancient and Mediaeval Ceylon, JRASCB(NS), Special Number, Vol. VI, 1959.

--- 'Additions and Amendments to the Historical Topography of Ancient and Mediaeval Ceylon,' JRASCB(NS) Vol. VII, (1960), pp. 225- 230.

Nilakanta Sastri, K. A., The Cōlas, Madras, 1955.

--- The Pāndyan Kingdom, London, 1925.

--- 'Śrī Vijaya', BEFEO Vol. XL (1940), pp. 239-310.

Obeysekera, G., 'The Great Tradition and the Little Tradition in the Perspective of Sinhalese Buddhism', Journal of Asian Studies Vol. XXII No. 2 pp. 139-153.

Pachow, W., 'Ancient Cultural Relations between Ceylon and China', UCR Vol. XII (1954) pp. 182-91.

Pandita, V., 'Buddhism during the Polonnaruva Period', Cey. Hist. Jnl. Vol. IV (1954-5) pp. 113-129.

Paññāsāra, D., Sanskrit Literature Extant among the Sinhalese, Colombo, 1958.

Paranavitana, S., 'Mahayanism in Ceylon', CJSG Vol. II (1928), pp. 35-71.

--- 'Pre-Buddhist Religious Beliefs in Ceylon', JRASCB Vol. XXXI, (1929) pp. 302-328.

--- 'Buddhist Festivals in Ceylon', Buddhist Studies (ed. B. C. Law), 1931, pp. 528-46.

--- 'Religious Intercourse between Burma and Siam in the 13th-15th Centuries,' JRASCB Vol. XXXII, (1932), pp. 190-213.

--- 'Negapatam and Theravāda Buddhism in South India', Jnl. of the Gtr. Ind. Soc. Vol. XI (1944) pp. 17-25.

--- 'Sīgiri - the Abode of the God-king', JRASCB(NS) Vol. I, (1950), pp. 129-83.

--- 'The Art and Architecture of the Polonnaruva Period', Cey. Hist. Jnrl.Vol. IV (1954-5), pp. 69-90.

--- 'Glimpses of the Political and Social Conditions of Mediaeval Ceylon' Paul Pieris Felicitation Volume, Colombo, 1956, pp. 69-74.

--- 'Ceylon and Malayasia in Mediaevel Times', JRASCB(NS) Vol. VII (1960), pp. 1-42.

Paranavitana, S., 'Some Regulations Concerning Village Irrigation Works in Ancient Ceylon', Cey. Jnl. of Hist. Soc. Stud., Vol. I, (1958), pp. 1-9.

--- 'The God of Adam's Peak, Ascona, 1958.

Parker, H., Ancient Ceylon, London, 1909.

Perera, L. S., 'Proprietary and Tenurial Rights in Ancient Ceylon', Cey. Jnl. of Hist. and Soc. Stud. Vol. II (1959), pp. 1-36.

Pieris, P. E., 'Nāgadīpa and Buddhist Remains in Jaffna', JRASCB Vol. XXVI, (1917), pp. 11-47 ; Vol. XXVIII, No. 72, (1919), pp. 40-67.

Poussin, Louis de la Vallée, Études et textes tantriques, Université de Gand, Recueil de travaux publié par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, Fasc. 16, 1896.

--- Bouddhisme: études et materiaux, London, 1898.

Quaritch Wales, H. G., 'Anuruddha and the Thaton Tradition', JRAS 1947, pp. 152-56.

Rahula, Walpola, History of Buddhism in Ceylon (3rd Century B.C. - 10th Century A.D.), Colombo, 1956.

Ramachandran, T. N., The Nāgapaṭṭanam and other Buddhist Bronzes in the Madras Museum, Bulletin of the Madras Museum, New Series, 1954.

Ray, N. R., An Introduction to the Study of Theravada Buddhism in Burma, Calcutta, 1946.

Saṅkṛtyāyana, Rāhul, 'Second Search of Sanskrit Palm-Leaf MSS in Tibet', Jnl. of the Bihar and Orissa Res. Soc., Vol. XXIII, 1937, pp. 1-57.

Seneviratna, John M., 'Some Notes on the Chinese References to Ceylon', JRASCB, Vol. XXIV, No. 68 (1915), pp. 106-118.

Srinivasan, P. R., The Story of Buddhism with Special Reference to South India, Madras, 1960.

Stein, B., 'The Economic Functions of the Mediaeval South Indian Temple', Jnl. of Asn. Stud. Vol. X, (1959-60), pp. 163-77.

Twitchett, D.C., 'Monastic Estates in T'ang China', Asia Major, Vol. V, 1956 pp. 123-145.

Twitchett, D. C., 'Monasteries in China's Economy in Mediaeval Times', Bull. of the Sch. of Or. and Afr. Stud. Vol. XIX, 1957, pp. 526-549.

University of Ceylon, History of Ceylon (ed. H. C. Ray and S. Paranavitana), Vol. I, Pts. 1 and 2, Colombo, 1959-60.

Weber, Max, The Religions of India, London, 1958.

---- From Max Weber (ed. H. W. Gerth and C. Wright Mills), London, 1961.

Warnakulasuriya, W. A., 'Inscriptional Evidence bearing on the Nature of Religious Endowments in Ancient Ceylon', UCR Vol. I (1943), pp.69-74; Vol. II (1944), pp. 74-82, 92-96.

Wickremasinghe, M., 'Tantrism in Ceylon and the Tisa Veva Lithic Diagram', Cey. Hist. Jnal. (1952).

Wickremasinghe, Sirima, 'Ceylon's Relations with South East Asia with Special Reference to Burma', Cey. Jnl. of Hist. and Soc. Stud. Vol. III, pp. 38-58.

Wijesekara, O. H. de A., 'Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva Period', Cey. Hist. Jnl. Vol. IV, (1954-5), pp. 91-97.

Wright, A.F., 'The Economic Role of Buddhism in China', Jnl. of Asn. Stud. Vol. XVI, (1957), pp. 408 -414.

B. Unpublished Monographs.

Ediyanagamage, Amaradasa, The Decline of Polonnaruva and the Rise of Dambadeniya, Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1963.

Perera, L. S., Institutions of Ceylon from Inscriptions, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Ceylon, 1949.

Prematillake, P. L., Religious Architecture and Sculpture of Ceylon, Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1964.

Than Tun, Maung, The Buddhist Church in Burma during the Pagan Period, Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1955.

Wickremasinghe,, Sirima, The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1958.

Wijetunga, W. M. K., The Rise and Decline of Cola Power in Ceylon, Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1962.

C. Reference Works.

Bibliographie bouddhique, Paris, 1928 - (in progress)

Clough, Benjamin, A Sinhalese-English Dictionary, Colombo, 1892.

Edgerton, Franklin, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, 2 vols., London, 1953.

Encyclopaedia of Buddhism (ed. G. P. Malalasekara), Fascs. A-Aca, Aca-Akaṇ, Akaṅkheyya Sutta - Anabhirati, Colombo, 1961 - (in progress).

Geiger, W., A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo, 1938.

Malalasekara, G. P., Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 2 vols., London, 1937.

Rhys Davids, T. W. and Stede, William, The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary, London, 1959.

Sorata, Välivitiye, Śrī Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya, 2 vols., Colombo, 1952, 1956.

Tamil Lexicon, University of Madras, Madras, 1926-39.

Williams, Monier, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Oxford, 1892.